THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOLUME LXXXV.

JANUARY AND APRIL, 1866.

"Truth can never be confirm'd enough,
Though doubts did ever sleep."
SHAKESPEARE.

„Wahrheitsliebe zeigt sich darin, daß man überall das Gute zu finden und zu schätzen weiß."
GÖTHE.

AMERICAN EDITION.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY THE LEONARD SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY,
38 WALKER STREET, WEST OF BROADWAY.

1866.

THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW,

No. CLXVII.

FOR JANUARY, 1866.

Art. I.—John Stuart Mill on the Philosophy of Sir Wm. Hamilton.

An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, and of the Principal Philosophical Questions discussed in his Writings. By John Stuart Mill. London: Longmans. 1865.

The work bearing the above title is an octavo volume, consisting of twenty-eight chapters, and five hundred and sixty pages. This is no great amount of print; but the amount of matter contained in it is prodigious, and the quality of that matter such as to require a full stretch of attention. Mr. Mill gives his readers no superfluous sentences, scarcely even a superfluous word, above what is necessary to express his meaning briefly and clearly. Of such a book no complete abstract can be given in the space to which we are confined.

To students of philosophy—doubtless but a minority among the general circle of English readers—this work comes recommended by the strongest claims both of interest and instruction. It presents in direct antithesis two most conspicuous representatives of the modern speculative mind of England—Sir W. Hamilton and Mr. John Stuart Mill.

Sir W. Hamilton has exercised powerful influence over the stream of thought during the present generation. The lectures on Logic and Metaphysics delivered by him at Edinburgh, for twenty years, determined the view taken of those subjects by a large number of aspiring young students, and determined that view for many of them permanently and irrevocably.* Several eminent teachers and writers of the present day are proud of considering themselves his disciples, enunciate his doctrines in greater or less proportion, and seldom contradict him without letting it be seen that they depart unwillingly from such a leader. Various new phrases and psychological illustrations have obtained footing in treatises of philosophy, chiefly from his authority. We do not number ourselves among his followers; but we think his influence on philosophy was in many ways beneficial. He kept up the idea of philosophy as a subject to be studied from its own points of view: a dignity which in earlier times it enjoyed, perhaps, to mischievous excess, but from which in recent times it has far too much receded—especially in England. He performed the great service of labouring strenuously to piece together the past traditions of philosophy, to re-discover those which had been allowed to drop into oblivion, and to make out the genealogy of opinions as far as negligent predecessors had still left the possibility of doing so.

The forty-six lectures on Metaphysics, and the thirty-five lectures on Logic, published by Messrs. Mansel and Veitch, constitute the biennial course actually delivered by Sir W. Hamilton in the Professorial Chair. They ought therefore to be looked at chiefly with reference to the minds of youthful hearers, as preservatives against that mischief forcibly described by Rousseau—"L'inhabitude de penser dans la jeunesse en ôte la capacité pendant le reste de la vie."

Now, in a subject so abstract, obscure, and generally unpalatable, as Logic and Metaphy-

---

* Mr. Mansel and Mr. Veitch, the editors of Sir W. Hamilton's Lectures on Metaphysics, posthumously published, say in their preface (p. xiii.)—

"For twenty years—from 1836 to 1856—the courses of logic and metaphysics were the means through which Sir William Hamilton sought to discipline and imbue with his philosophical opinions the numerous youth who gathered from Scotland and other countries to his class-room; and while, by these prelections, the author supplemented, developed, and moulded the national philosophy, leaving thereon the ineffaceable impress of his genius and learning, he, at the same time and by the same means, exercised over the intellects and feelings of his pupils an influence which, for depth, feeling and elevation, was certainly never surpassed by that of any philosophical instructor. Among his pupils there are not a few who, having lived for a season under the constraining power of his intellect, and been led to reflect on those great questions regarding the character, origin, and bounds of human knowledge, which his teaching stirred and quickened, bear the memory of their beloved and revered instructor inseparably blended with what is highest in their present intellectual life, as well as in their practical aims and aspirations."

sics, the difficulty which the teacher finds in inspiring interest is extreme. That Sir W. Hamilton overcame such difficulty with remarkable success, is the affirmation of his two editors; and our impression, as readers of his lectures, disposes us to credit them. That Sir W. Hamilton should have done this effectively is in itself sufficient to stamp him as a meritorious professor—as a worthy successor to the chair of Dugald Stewart, whose unrivalled perfection in that department is attested by every one. Many a man who ultimately adopted speculative opinions opposed to Dugald Stewart, received his first impulse and guidance in the path of speculation from the lasting impression made by Stewart's lectures.

But though we look at these lectures, as they ought to be looked at, chiefly with a view to the special purpose for which they were destined, we are far from insinuating that they have no other merits, or that they are useless for readers who have already a metaphysical creed of their own. We have found them both instructive and interesting: they go over a large portion of the field of speculative philosophy, partly from the point of view (not always the same) belonging to the author, partly from that of numerous predecessors whom he cites. We recognise also in Sir W. Hamilton an amount of intellectual independence which seldom accompanies such vast erudition. He recites many different opinions, but he judges them all for himself; and, what is of still greater moment, he constantly gives the reasons for his judgments. To us these reasons are always of more or less value, whether we admit them to be valid or not. Many philosophers present their own doctrine as if it were so much ascertained and acknowledged truth, either intimating, or leading you to suppose, that though erroneous beliefs to the contrary formerly prevailed, these have now become discredited with every one. We do not censure this way of proceeding, but we prefer the manner of Sir W. Hamilton. He always keeps before us divergence and discrepancy of view as the normal condition of reasoned truth or philosophy; the characteristic postulate of which is, that every affirmative and every negative shall have its appropriate reasons clearly and fully enunciated.

In this point of view, the appendix annexed to the lectures is also valuable; and the four copious appendixes or dissertations following the edition of Reid's works, are more valuable still. How far Sir W. Hamilton has there furnished good proof of his own doctrines on External Perception, and on the Primary Qualities of Matter, we shall not now determine; but to those who dissent from him, as well as to those who agree with him, his reasonings on these subjects are highly instructive: while the full citations from so many other writers contribute materially not only to elucidate the points directly approached, but also to enlarge our knowledge of philosophy generally. We set particular value upon this preservation of the traditions of philosophy, and upon this maintenance of a known perpetual succession among the speculative minds of humanity, with proper comparisons and contrasts. We have found among the names quoted by Sir W. Hamilton, and, thanks to his care, several authors hardly at all known to us, and opinions cited from them not less instructive than curious. He deserves the more gratitude, because he departs herein from received usage since Bacon and Descartes. The example set by these great men was admirable, so far as it went to throw off the authority of predecessors; but pernicious so far as it banished those predecessors out of knowledge, like mere magazines of immaturity and error. Throughout the eighteenth century, all study of the earlier modes of philosophizing was, for the most part, neglected. Of such neglect, remarkable instances are pointed out by Sir W. Hamilton.

While speaking about the general merits and philosophical position of Sir William Hamilton, we have hitherto said nothing about those of Mr. Mill. But before we proceed to analyse the separate chapters of his volume, we must devote a few words to the fulfilment of another obligation.

Mr. John Stuart Mill has not been the first to bestow honour on the surname which he bears. His father, Mr. James Mill, had already ennobled the name. An ampler title to distinction in history and philosophy can seldom be produced than that which Mr. James Mill left behind him. We know no work which surpasses his "History of British India" in the main excellences attainable by historical writers: industrious accumulation, continued for many years, of original authorities—careful and conscientious criticism of their statements—and a large command of psychological analysis, enabling the author to interpret phenomena of society, both extremely complicated, and far removed from his own personal experience. Again, Mr. James Mill's "Elements of Political Economy" were, at the time when they appeared, the most logical and condensed exposition of the entire science then existing. Lastly, his latest avowed production, the "Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind," is a model of perspicuous exposition of complex states of consciousness, carried farther than by any other author before him; and illustrating the fulness which such exposition may be made to attain, by one who has faith in the comprehensive principle of association, and has learnt the secret of tracing out its innumerable windings. It is, moreover, the first work in which the great fact of Indissoluble Association is brought into its due theoretical prominence. These are high merits, of which lasting evidence is before the public; but there were other merits in Mr. James Mill, less publicly authenticated, yet not less real. His unpremeditated oral exposition was hardly less effective than his prepared work with the pen; his colloquial fertility on philosophical subjects, his power of discussing himself, and of stimulating others to discuss, his ready responsive inspirations through all the shifts and windings of a sort of Platonic dialogue—all these accomplishments were, to those who knew him, even more impressive than what he composed for the press. Conversation with him was not merely instructive,

but provocative to the dormant intelligence. Of all persons whom we have known, Mr. James Mill was the one who stood least remote from the lofty Platonic idea of Dialectic—Τοῦ διδόναι καὶ δέχεσθαι λόγον—(the giving and receiving of reasons) competent alike to examine others, or to be examined by them, on philosophy. When to this we add a strenuous character, earnest convictions, and single-minded devotion to truth, with an utter disdain of mere paradox—it may be conceived that such a man exercised powerful intellectual ascendancy over younger minds. Several of those who enjoyed his society—men now at or past the maturity of life, and some of them in distinguished positions—remember and attest with gratitude such ascendancy in their own cases: among them the writer of the present article, who owes to the historian of British India an amount of intellectual stimulus and guidance such as he can never forget.

When a father, such as we have described, declining to send his son either to school or college, constituted himself school-master from the beginning, and performed that duty with laborious solicitude—when, besides full infusion of modern knowledge, the forcing process applied by the Platonic Socrates to the youthful Theætetus, was administered by Mr. James Mill, continuously and from an earlier age, to a youthful mind not less pregnant than that of Theætetus—it would be surprising if the son thus trained had not reached even a higher eminence than his father. The fruit borne by Mr. John Stuart Mill has been worthy of the culture bestowed, and the volume before us is at once his latest and his ripest product.

The "Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy" is intended by Mr. Mill (so he tells us in the preface to the sixth published edition of his "System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive") as a sequel and complement to that system. We are happy to welcome so valuable an addition; but with or without that addition, the "System of Logic" appears to us to present the most important advance in speculative theory which the present century has witnessed. Either half of it, the Ratiocinative or the Inductive, would have surpassed any previous work on the same subject. The Inductive half discriminates and brings into clear view, for the first time, those virtues of method which have insensibly grown into habits among consummate scientific enquirers of the post-Baconian age, as well as the fallacies by which some of these authors have been misled—the Ratiocinative half, dealing with matters which had already been well handled by Dutrieu and other scholastic logicians, invests their dead though precise formalism with a real life and application to the actual process of finding and proving truth. But besides thus working each half up to perfection, Mr. Mill has performed the still more difficult task of overcoming the repugnance, apparently an inveterate repugnance, between them, so as chemically to combine the two into one homogeneous compound; thus presenting the problem of Reasoned Truth, Inference, Proof, and Disproof, as one connected whole. For ourselves, we still recollect the mist which was cleared from our minds when we first read the "System of Logic," very soon after it was published. We were familiar with the Syllogistic Logic in Burgersdicius and Dutrieu; we were also familiar with examples of the best procedure in modern inductive science; but the two streams flowed altogether apart in our minds, like two parallel lines never joining nor approaching. The irreconcileability of the two was at once removed, when we had read and mastered the second and third chapters of the Second Book of the "System of Logic;" in which Mr. Mill explains the functions and value of the syllogism, and the real import of its major premiss. This explanation struck us at the time as one of the most profound and original efforts of metaphysical thought that we had ever perused, and we see no reason to retract that opinion now.* It appears all the more valuable when we contrast it with what is said by Mr. Mill's two contemporaries—Hamilton and Whately: the first of whom retains the ancient theory of Reasoning, as being only a methodised transition from a whole to its parts, and from the parts up to the whole—Induction being only this ascending part of the process, whereby, after having given a complete enumeration of all the compound parts, you conclude to the sum total described in one word as a whole;† while the second

* We are happy to find such high authorities as Dr. Whewell, Mr. Samuel Bailey, and Sir John Herschel concurring in this estimation of the new logical point of view thus opened by Mr. Mill. We will not call it a *discovery*, since Sir John Herschel thinks the expression unsuitable. See the recent sixth edition of the "System of Logic," vol. i. p. 229.

† See Sir William Hamilton's "Lectures on Logic" (Lect. xvii. p. 320-321; also Appendix to those Lectures, p. 361). He here distinguishes also formal induction from material induction, which latter he brings under the grasp of sylolgism, by an hypothesis in substance similar to that of Whately. There is, however, in Lecture xix. (p. 380), a passage in a very different spirit, which one might almost imagine to have been written by Mr. Mill:—"In regard to simple syllogisms, it was an original dogma of the Platonic school, and an early dogma of the Peripatetic, that science, strictly so called, was only conversant with, and was exclusively contained in, universals; and the doctrine of Aristotle, which taught that all our general knowledge is only an induction from an observation of particulars, was too easily forgotten or perverted by his followers. It thus obtained almost the force of an acknowledged principle, that everything to be known must be known under some general form or notion. Hence the exaggerated importance attributed to definition and deduction; it not being considered that we only take out of a general notion what we had previously placed therein, and that the amplification of our knowledge is not to be sought for from above but from below—not from speculation about abstract generalities, but from the observation of concrete particulars. But however erroneous and irrational, the persuasion had its day and influence, and it perhaps determined, as one of its effects, the total neglect of one half, and that not the least important half, of the reasoning process."

These very just observations are suggested to Sir William Hamilton by a train of thought which has little natural tendency to suggest them, viz.: by the distinction upon which he so much insists, between the logic of comprehension and the logic of exten-

(Whately) agrees in subordinating Induction to Syllogism, but does so in a different way—by representing inductive reasoning as a syllogism, with its major premiss suppressed, from which major premiss it derived its authority. The explanation of Mr. Mill attacks the problem from the opposite side. It subordinates syllogism to induction, the technical to the real; it divests the major premiss of its illusory pretence to be itself the proving authority, or even any real and essential part of the proof—and acknowledges it merely as a valuable precautionary test and security for avoiding mistake in the process of proving. Taking Mr. Mill's "System of Logic" as a whole, it is one of the books by which we believe ourselves to have most profited. The principles of it are constantly present to our mind when engaged in investigations of evidence, whether scientific or historical.

Concerned as we are here with Mr. Mill only as a logician and philosopher, we feel precluded from adverting to his works on other topics—even to his "Elements of Political Economy," by which he is probably more widely known than by anything else. Of the many obligations which Political Economy owes to him, one only can be noticed consistent with the scope of the present article: the care which he has taken—he alone, or at least, he more explicitly and formally than any other expositor—to set forth the general position of that science in the aggregate field of scientific research; its relation to sociology as a whole, or to other fractions thereof, how far derivative or co-ordinate; what are its fundamental postulates or hypotheses, with what limits the logical methods of induction and deduction are applicable to it, and how far its conclusions may be relied on as approximations to truth. All these points will be found instructively handled in the Sixth Book of Mr. Mill's "System of Logic," as well as in his smaller and less known work, "Essays on Some Unsettled Questions in Political Economy." We find him, while methodizing and illustrating the data of the special science, uniformly keeping in view its relation to philosophy as a whole.

But there is yet another work in which the interests of philosophy, as a whole, come into the foreground and become the special object of vindication in their largest compass and most vital requirements. We mean Mr. Mill's "Essay on Liberty," one half of which takes for its thesis the *libertas philosophandi*. He maintains, emphatically, in this book the full dignity of reasoned truth against all the jealous exigencies of traditional dogma and self-justifying sentiment. He claims the most unreserved liberty of utterance for negative and affirmative on all questions—not merely for the purpose of discriminating truth from falsehood, but also to keep up in individual minds the full sense and understanding of the matters controverted, in place of a mere partial and one-sided adhesion. At first sight, indeed, it might seem as if Mr. Mill was fighting with a shadow; for liberty of philosophizing is a postulate which, in general terms, every one concedes. But when you come to fathom the real feelings which underlie this concession, you discover that almost every man makes it under reserves which, though acting in silence, are not the less efficacious. Every one has some dogmas which he cannot bear to hear advocated, and others which he will not allow to be controverted in his presence. A writer has to consider not merely by what reasons any novelty of belief or disbelief may be justified, but also how much it will be safe for him to publish, having regard to the irritable sore places of the public judgment. In July, 1864, we were present at the annual meeting of the French Academy at Paris, where the prizes for essays sent in, pursuant to subjects announced for study beforehand, are awarded. We heard the titles of various compositions announced by the President (M. Villemain), with a brief critical estimate of each. Their comparative merits were appreciated, and the prize awarded to one of the competitors. Among the compositions sent to compete for the prize, one was a work by M. Taine, upon which the President bestowed the most remarkable encomiums, in every point of view: extent of knowledge, force of thought, style, arrangement, all were praised in a manner which we have rarely heard exceeded. Nevertheless, the prize was not awarded to this work, but to another which the President praised in a manner decidedly less marked and emphatic. What was here the *ratio decidendi?* The reason was, and the President declared it in the most explicit language, that the work of M. Taine *was deeply tainted with materialism.* "Sans doute," said the esteemed veteran of French literature in pronouncing his award, "sans doute les opinions sont libres, *mais.*"—It is precisely against this *mais*—ushering in the special anathematised or consecrated conclusion which it is intended to except from the general liberty of enforcing or impugning—in matters of philosophical discussion, that Mr. Mill, in the "Essay on Liberty," declares war as champion of Reasoned Truth.

He handles this grand theme—ἐλευθέρως ἐλευθέρως φιλοσοφεῖν—involving as it does the best interests of philosophy, as an instructress to men's judgments, and a stimulus to their intelligence—with great depth of psychological analysis sustained by abundant historical illustration. And he in the same volume discusses most profitably another question akin to it—To what extent and by what principles the interference of others is justifiable, in restraining the liberty of taste and action for each individual? A question at once grave and neglected, but the discussion of which does not belong to our present article.

A new work from one who has already manifested such mastery of philosophy, both in principle and in detail, and a work exhibiting

---

sion, and by his anxiety to explain why the former had been exclusively cultivated and the latter neglected.

That which Sir William Hamilton calls here truly the doctrine of Aristotle (at least, in one place at the close of the Analyt. Post.) and which he states to have been forgotten by Aristotle's followers—was hardly less forgotten or neglected by Aristotle himself.

the analysis and appreciation of the philosophical views of an eminent contemporary, must raise the highest expectation. We think no reader will be disappointed who peruses Mr. Mill's "Examination," and we shall now endeavour to give some account of the manner in which he performs it. Upon topics so abstract and subtle as the contents of this volume, the antithesis between two rival theories is the best way, and often the only way, for bringing truth into clear view; and the "Examination" here before us is professedly controversy. But of controversy in its objectionable sense—of captious or acrimonious personality—not a trace will here be found. A dignified, judicial equanimity of tone is preserved from first to last. Moreover, though the title and direct purpose of the volume is negative and critical, yet the destructive criticism is pervaded by many copious veins of constructive exposition, embodying Mr. Mill's own views upon some of the most intricate problems of metaphysics.

Mr. Mill begins his work by analysing and explaining the doctrine called the Relativity of Human Knowledge:—

"The doctrine (chap. ii. p. 5) which is thought to belong in the most especial manner to Sir W. Hamilton, and which was the ground of his opposition to the transcendentalism of the later French and German metaphysicians, is that which he and others have called the Relativity of Human Knowledge. It is the subject of the most generally known and impressive of all his writings—the one which first revealed to the English metaphysical reader that a new power had arisen in philosophy. Together with its developments, it composes the Philosophy of the Conditioned, which he opposed to the French and German philosophies of the Absolute, and which is regarded by most of his admirers as the greatest of his titles to a permanent place in the history of metaphysical thought. But, 'the relativity of human knowledge,' like most other phrases into which the words *relative* or *relation* enter, is vague, and admits of a great variety of meanings, &c."

Mr. Mill then proceeds to distinguish these various meanings, and to determine in which of them the phrase is understood by Sir W. Hamilton.

One meaning is, that we only know anything by knowing it as distinguished from something else—that all consciousness is of difference. It is not, however, in this sense that the expression is ordinarily or intentionally used by Sir W. Hamilton, though he fully recognises the truth which, when thus used, it serves to express. In general, when he says that all our knowledge is relative, the relation he has in view is not between the thing known and other objects compared with it, but between the thing known and the mind knowing—(p. 6.)

The doctrine in this last meaning is held by different philosophers in two different forms. Some (*e.g.*, Berkeley, Hume, Ferrier, &c.), usually called Idealists, maintain not merely that all we can possibly know of anything is the manner in which it affects the human faculties, but that there is nothing else to be known; that affections of human or of other minds are all that we can know to exist—that the difference between the ego and the non-ego is only a formal distinction between two aspects of the same reality. Other philosophers (Brown, Mr. Herbert Spencer, Auguste Comte, with many others) believe that the ego and the non-ego denote two realities, each self-existent, and neither dependent on the other; that the Noumenon, or "thing *per se*," is in itself a different thing from the Phenomenon, and equally or more real, but that, though we know its existence, we have no means of knowing what it is. All that we can know is, relatively to ourselves, the modes in which it affects us, or the phenomena which it produces—(pp. 9—11.)

The doctrine of Relativity, as held by Kant and his many followers, is next distinguished from the same doctrine as held by Hartley, James Mill, Professor Bain, &c., compatible with either acceptance or rejection of the Berkeleian theory. Kant maintains that the attributes which we ascribe to outward things, or which are inseparable from them in thought, contain additional elements, over and above sensations *plus* an unknowable cause—additional elements added by the mind itself, and therefore still only relative, but constituting the original furniture of the mind itself—inherent laws, partly of our sensitive, partly of our intellectual faculty. It is on this latter point that Hartley and those going along with him diverge. Admitting the same additional elements, these philosophers do not ascribe to the mind any innate forms to account for them, but hold that Place, Extension, Substance, Cause, and the rest, &c., are conceptions put together out of ideas of sensation, by the known laws of Association—(pp. 12—14.)

Partial Relativity is the opinion professed by most philosophers (and by most persons who do not philosophise). They hold that we know things partly as they are in themselves, partly as they are merely in relation to us.

This discrimination of the various schools of philosophers is highly instructive, and is given with the full perspicuity belonging to Mr. Mill's style. He proceeds to examine in what sense Sir W. Hamilton maintained the Relativity of Human Knowledge. He cites passages both from the "Discussions on Philosophy" and from the Lectures, in which that doctrine is both affirmed in its greatest amplitude, and enunciated in the most emphatic language—(pp. 17, 18, 22, 23.) But he also produces extracts from the most elaborate of Sir W. Hamilton's "Dissertations on Reid," in which a doctrine quite different and inconsistent is proclaimed —that our knowledge is only partially, not wholly, relative; that the secondary qualities of matter, indeed, are known to us only relatively, but that the primary qualities are known to us as they are in themselves, or as they exist objectively, and that they may be even evolved by demonstration *à priori*—(pp. 19—26, 30.) The inconsistency between the two doctrines, professed at different times and in different works by Sir W. Hamilton, is certainly manifest. Mr. Mill is of opinion that one of the two must be taken "in a non-natural sense," and that Sir W. Hamilton either did not hold, or had ceased to hold, the doctrine of the full relativity of knowledge (pp. 20—28)—

the hypothesis of a flat contradiction being in his view inadmissible. But we think it at least equally possible that Sir W. Hamilton held both the two opinions in their natural sense, and enforced both of them *at different times* by argument; his attention never having been called to the contradiction between them. That such forgetfulness was quite possible, will appear clearly in many parts of the present article. His argument in support of both is equally characterised by that peculiar energy of style which is frequent with him, and which no way resembles the qualifying refinements of one struggling to keep clear of a perceived contradiction.

From hence Mr. Mill (chap. iv.) proceeds to criticise at considerable length what he justly denominates the celebrated and striking review of Cousin's philosophy, which forms the first paper in Sir W. Hamilton's "Discussions on Philosophy." According to Mr. Mill—

> "The question really at issue, is this: Have we or have we not an immediate intuition of God? The name of God is veiled under two extremely abstract phrases, 'The Infinite and the Absolute,' perhaps from a reverential feeling; such, at least, is the reason given by Sir W. Hamilton's disciple, Mr. Mansel, for preferring the more vague expressions; but it is one of the most unquestionable of all logical maxims, that the meaning of the abstract must be sought for in the concrete, and not conversely; and we shall see, both in the case of Sir William Hamilton and of Mr. Mansel, that the process cannot be reversed with impunity."—p. 32.

Upon this we must remark, that though the "logical maxim" here laid down by Mr. Mill may be generally sound, we think the application of it inconvenient in the present case. Discussions on points of philosophy are best conducted without either invoking or offending religious feeling. M. Cousin maintains that we have a direct intuition of the Infinite and the Absolute: Sir W. Hamilton denies that we have. Upon this point Mr. Mill sides entirely with Sir W. Hamilton, and considers "that the latter has rendered good service to philosophy by refuting M. Cousin," though much of the reasoning employed in such refutation seems to Mr. Mill unsound. But Sir W. Hamilton goes further, and affirms that we have no faculties capable of apprehending the Infinite and the Absolute—that both of them are inconceivable to us, and by consequence unknowable. Herein Mr. Mill is opposed to him, and controverts his doctrine in an elaborate argument.

Of this argument, able and ingenious, like all those in the present volume, our limits only enable us to give a brief appreciation. In so far as Mr. Mill controverts Sir W. Hamilton, we think him perfectly successful, though there are some points of his reasoning in which we do not fully concur.

In our opinion, as in his, the Absolute alone (in its sense as opposed to relative) can be declared necessarily unknowable, inconceivable, incogitable. Nothing which falls under the condition of relativity can be declared to be so. The structure of our minds renders us capable of knowing everything which is relative, though there are many such things which we have no evidence, nor shall ever get evidence, to enable us to know. Now the Infinite falls within the conditions of relativity, as indeed Sir W. Hamilton himself admits, when he intimates (p. 58) that though it cannot be known, it is, must be, and ought to be, *believed* by us, according to the marked distinction which he draws between belief and knowledge. We agree with Mr. Mill in the opinion that it is thinkable, conceivable, knowable. Doubtless we do not conceive it adequately, but we conceive it sufficiently to discuss and reason upon it intelligibly to ourselves and others. That we conceive the Infinite inadequately, is not to be held as proof that we do not conceive it at all; for in regard to finite things also, we conceive the greater number of them only inadequately.

We cannot construe to the imagination a polygon with an infinite number of sides (*i.e.*, with a number of sides greater than any given number), but neither can we construe to the imagination a polygon with a million of sides; nevertheless, we understand what is meant by the first description as well as by the second, and can reason upon both. There is, indeed, this difference between the two: That the terms used in describing the first proclaim at once in their direct meaning that we should in vain attempt to construe it to the imagination; whereas the terms used in describing the second do not intimate that fact. We know the fact only by trial, or by an estimate of our own mental force which is the result of many past trials. If the difference here noted were all which Sir W. Hamilton has in view when he declares the Infinite to be unknowable and incogitable, we should accede to his opinion; but we apprehend that he means much more, and he certainly requires more to justify the marked antithesis in which he places himself against M. Cousin and Hegel. Indeed, the facility with which he declares matters to be incogitable, which these two and other philosophers not only cogitate but maintain as truth, is to us truly surprising. The only question which appears to us important is, whether we can understand and reason upon the meaning of the terms and propositions addressed to us. If we can, the subjects propounded must be cogitable and conceivable, whether we admit the propositions affirmed concerning them or not; if we cannot, then these subjects are indeed incogitable by ourselves in the present state of our knowledge, but they may not be so to our opponent who employs the terms.

In criticising the arguments of Sir W. Hamilton against M. Cousin, Mr. Mill insists much on a distinction between (1) the Infinite, and (2) the Infinite in any one or more positive attributes, such as infinite wisdom, goodness, redness, hardness &c.* He thinks that Sir W. Hamilton has made out his case against the first, but not against the last; that the first is really "an unmeaning and senseless abstraction," a fasciculus of negations, unknowable

* The distinction is given by Stier and other logicians. 1. Infinitum simpliciter. 2. Infinitum secundum quid, sive in certo genere.

and inconceivable, but not the last. We think that Mr. Mill makes more of this distinction than the case warrants; that the first is not unmeaning, but an intelligible abstraction, only a higher reach of abstraction than the last; that it is knowable inadequately, in the same way as the last, though more inadequately, because of its higher abstraction.

As the Finite is intelligible, so also is its negation—the Infinite: we do not say (with M. Cousin) that the two are conjointly given in consciousness—but the two are understood and partially apprehended by the mind, conjointly and in contrast. Though the Infinite is doubtless negative as to degree, it is not wholly or exclusively negative, since it includes a necessary reference to some positive attribute, to which the degree belongs; the positive element is not eliminated, but merely left undetermined. The Infinite (like the Finite, *τὸ πεπερασμένον—τὸ ἄπειρον*) is a genus; it comprehends under it the Infinitely Hard and the Infinitely Soft, the Infinitely Swift and the Infinitely Slow—the infinite, in short, of any or all positive attributes. It includes, doubtless, "a farrago of contradictions;" but so, also, does the Finite—and so, also, do the actual manifestations of the real, concrete universe, which manifestations constitute a portion of the Finite. Whoever attempts to give any philosophical account of the generation of the universe, tracing its phenomena as an aggregate, to some ultra-phenomenal origin—must include in his scheme a *fundamentum* for all those opposite and contradictory manifestations which experience discloses in the universe. There always have been, and still are, many philosophers who consider the Abstract and General to be prior both in nature and time to the Concrete and Particular; and who hold further that these two last are explained, when presented as determinate and successive manifestations of the two first, which they conceive as indeterminate and sempiternal. Now the Infinite (ens Infinitum or entia Infinita, according to the point of view in which we look at it) is a generic word, including all these supposed indeterminate antecedents; and including therefore, of course, many contradictory agencies. But this does not make it senseless or unmeaning; nor can we distinguish it from "the Infinite in some one or more given attributes," by any other character than by greater reach of abstraction. We cannot admit the marked distinction which Mr. Mill contends for—that the one is unknowable and the other knowable.

It may be proper to add, that the mode of philosophising which we have just described is not ours. We do not agree in this way either of conceiving, or of solving, the problem of philosophy. But it is a mode so prevalent that Trendelenberg speaks of it, justly enough, as "the ancient Hysteron-Proteron of Abstraction." The doctrine of these philosophers appears to us unfounded, but we cannot call it unmeaning.

In another point, also, we differ from Mr. Mill respecting that inferior abstraction which he calls "the Infinite in some particular attribute." He speaks as if this could be known not only as an abstraction, a conceivable, an ideal—but also as a concrete reality; as if "we could know a concrete reality as infinite or as absolute" (p. 45); as if there really existed in actual nature "concrete persons or things possessing infinitely or absolutely certain specific attributes"—(pp. 55—93.) To this doctrine we cannot subscribe. As we understand concrete reality, we find no evidence to believe that there exist in nature any real concrete persons or things, possessing to an infinite degree such attributes as they do possess: *e g.*, any men infinitely wise or infinitely strong, any horses infinitely swift, any stones infinitely hard. Such concrete real objects appear to us not admissible, because experience not only has not certified their existence in any single case, but goes as far to disprove their existence as it can do to disprove anything. All the real objects in nature known to us by observation are finite, and possess only in a finite measure their respective attributes. Upon this is founded the process of Science, so comprehensively laid out by Mr. Mill in his "System of Logic"—Induction, Deduction from general facts attested by Induction, Verification by experience of the results obtained by Deduction. The attributes, whiteness or hardness, in the abstract, are doubtless infinite; that is, the term will designate, alike and equally, any degree of whiteness or hardness which you may think of, and any unknown degree even whiter and harder than what you think of. But when perceived as invested in a given mass of snow or granite before us, they are divested of that indeterminateness, and become restricted to a determinate measure and degree.

Having thus indicated the points on which we are compelled to dissent from Mr. Mill's refutation of Sir W. Hamilton in the pleading against M. Cousin, we shall pass to the seventh chapter, in which occurs his first controversy with Mr. Mansel. This passage has excited more interest, and will probably be remembered by a larger number of readers, than any portion of the book. We shall give it in his own words (pp. 99—103) since the energetic phraseology is quite as remarkable as the thought:—

"There is but one way for Mr. Mansel out of this difficulty, and he adopts it. He must maintain not merely that an Absolute Being is unknowable in himself, but that the Relative attributes of an Absolute Being are unknowable also.* He must say that we do not know what Wisdom, Justice, Benevolence, Mercy, &c., are, as they exist in God. Accordingly, he does say so. 'It is a fact (says Mr. Mansel) which experience forces upon us, and which it is useless, were it possible, to disguise, that the represen-

* This doctrine has been affirmed (so far as reason is concerned, apart from revelation) not merely by Mr. Mansel, but also by Pascal, one of the most religious philosophers of the seventeenth century, in the "Pensées":—

"Parlons selon les lumières naturelles. S'il y a un Dieu, il est infiniment incompréhensible; puisque, n'ayant ni principes ni bornes, il n'a nul rapport à nous; nous sommes donc incapables de connaître ni ce qu'il est, ni s'il est."—(See Arago, Biographie de Condorcet, p. lxxxiv., prefixed to his edition of Condorcet's works.)

tation of God after the model of the highest human morality which we are capable of conceiving, is not sufficient to account for all the phenomena exhibited by the course of His natural Providence. The infliction of physical suffering, the permission of moral evil, the adversity of the good, the prosperity of the wicked, the crimes of the guilty involving the misery of the innocent, the tardy appearance and partial distribution of moral and religious knowledge in the world—these are facts which no doubt are reconcileable, we know not how, with the Infinite Goodness of God, but which certainly are not to be explained on the supposition that its sole and sufficient type is to be found in the finite goodness of man.'

"In other words (continues Mr. Mill, commenting) it is necessary to suppose that the infinite goodness ascribed to God is not the goodness which we know and love in our fellow-creatures, distinguished only as infinite in degree; but is different in kind, and another quality altogether. Accordingly Mr. Mansel combats as a heresy of his opponents, the opinion that infinite goodness differs only in degree from finite goodness.—Here, then, I take my stand upon the acknowledged principle of logic and of morality; that when we mean different things we have no right to call them by the same name, and to apply to them the same predicates, moral and intellectual. If instead of the glad tidings that there exists a Being in whom all the excellences which the highest human mind can conceive, exist in a degree inconceivable to us, I am informed that the world is ruled by a Being whose attributes are infinite, but what they are we cannot learn, except that the highest human morality does not sanction them—convince me of this, and I will bear my fate as I may. But when I am told that I must believe this, and at the same time call this being by the names which express and affirm the highest human morality, I say, in plain terms, that I will not. Whatever power such a being may have over me, there is one thing which he shall not do; he shall not compel me to worship him. I will call no being good, who is not what I mean when I apply that epithet to my fellow-creatures; and if such a being can sentence me to hell for not so calling him, to hell I will go."

This concluding declaration is memorable in many ways. Mr. Mill announces his resolution to determine for himself, and according to his own reason and conscience, what God he will worship, and what God he will not worship. For ourselves, we cordially sympathize with his resolution. But Mr. Mill must be aware that this is a point on which society is equally resolved that no individual shall determine for himself, if they can help it.* Each new-born child finds his religious creed ready prepared for him. In his earliest days of unconscious infancy, the stamp of the national, gentile, phratric, God, or Gods, is imprinted upon him by his elders; and if the future man, in the exercise of his own independent reason, acquires such convictions as compel him to renounce those Gods, proclaiming openly that he does so—he must count upon such treatment as will go far to spoil the value of the present life to him, even before he passes to those ulterior liabilities which Mr. Mill indicates in the distance. We are not surprised that a declaration so unusual and so impressive should have been often cited in critical notices of this volume; that during the month preceding the last Westminster election, it was studiously brought forward by some opponents of Mr. Mill, and more or less regretted by his friends, as likely to offend many electors, and damage his chance of success; and that a conspicuous and noble-minded ecclesiastic, the Dean of Westminster, thought the occasion so grave as to come forward with his characteristic generosity for the purpose of shielding a distinguished man suspected of heresy.

The sublime self-assertion, addressed by Prometheus to Zeus, under whose sentence he was groaning, has never before been put into such plain English.* Mr. Mill's declaration reminds us also of Hippolytus, the chaste and pure youth, whose tragic fate is so beautifully described by Euripides. Hippolytus is exemplary in his devotions to the Goddess Artemis; but he dissents from all his countrymen, and determines for himself, in refusing to bestow the smallest mark of honour or worship upon Aphrodite, because he considers her to be a very bad Goddess.† In this refusal he

* The indictment under which Socrates was condemned at Athens, as reported by Xenophon at the commencement of the Memorabilia, ran thus—"Socrates is guilty of crime, inasmuch as he does not believe in those Gods in whom the City believes, but introduces other novelties in regard to the Gods; he is guilty also, inasmuch as he corrupts the youth."

These words express clearly a sentiment entertained, not merely by the Athenian people, but generally by other societies also. They all agree in antipathy to free, individual, dissenting reason, though that antipathy manifests itself by acts, more harsh in one place, less harsh in another. The Hindoo who declares himself a convert to Christianity, becomes at the same time an outcast (*ἀφρήτωρ, ἀθέμιστος, ἀνέστιος*) among those whose Gods he has deserted. As a general fact, the man who dissents from his fellows upon fundamentals of religion, purchases an undisturbed life only by being content with that "semi-liberty under silence and concealment," for which Cicero was thankful under the dictatorship of Julius Cæsar. "Obsecro—abjiciamus ista, et semiliberi saltem simus; quod assequemur *et tacendo et latendo*" (Epist. ad Attic. xiii., 31). Contrast with this the memorable declaration of Socrates, in the Platonic Apology, that silence and abstinence from cross-examination were intolerable to him; that life would not be worth having under such conditions.

* Æschyl. Prometh., 996-1006—

πρὸς ταῦτα, βιπτέσθω μὲν ἀιθαλοῦσσα φλὸξ,
λευκοπτέρῳ δὲ νιφάδι καὶ βροντήμασιν
χθονίοις κυκάτω πάντα καὶ ταρασσέτω·
γνάμψει γὰρ οὐδὲν τῶνδέ μ'——
ἐισελθέτω σε μήποτ', ὡς ἐγὼ, Διὸς
γνώμην φοβηθεὶς, θηλύνους γενήσομαι,
καὶ λιπαρήσω τὸν μέγα στυγούμενον
γυναικομίμοις ὑπτιάσμασιν χερῶν,
λῦσάι με δέσμων τῶνδε· τοῦ παντὸς δέω.

Also v. 1047, et seq. The memorable ode of Goethe, entitled *Prometheus*, embodies a similar vein of sentiment in the finest poetry.

† Euripid. Hippol., 10—

(Aph.) *ὁ γὰρ με Θησεως παῖς, Ἀμάζονος τόκος,*
μόνος πολιτῶν τῆσδε γῆς Τροιζηνίας
λέγει κακίστην δαιμόνων πεφυκέναι·
φόιβου δ' ἀδελφὴν Ἄρτεμιν,——
τιμᾷ, μεγίστην δαιμόνων ἡγούμενος—

(Hipp.) *τὴν σὴν δὲ Κύπριν πόλλ' ἐγὼ χαίρειν λέγω—*
(112.)

See also v. 1328-1402.

persists with inflexible principle (even after having received, from an anxious attendant, warning of the certain ruin which it will being upon him), until the insulted Aphrodite involves him along with the unhappy Phædra and Theseus himself, in one common abyss of misery. In like manner, Mr. Mill's declaration stands in marked contrast with the more cautious proceeding of men like Herodotus. That historian, alike pious and prudent, is quite aware that all the Gods are envious and mischief-making, and expressly declares them to be so.* Yet, far from refusing to worship them on that account, he is assiduous in prayer and sacrifice—perhaps, indeed, all the more assiduous from what he believes about their attributes ;† being persuaded (like the attendant who warned Hippolytus) that his only chance of mollifying their ungentle dispositions in regard to himself is, by honorific tribute in words and offerings.

When, however, after appreciating as we are bound to do, Mr. Mill's declaration of subjective sentiment, we pass to its logical bearing on the controversy between him and Mr. Mansel, we are obliged to confess that in this point of view it has little objective relevancy. The problem was, how to reconcile the actual evil and suffering in the universe (which is recited as a fact by Mr. Mansel, though in terms conveying a most inadequate idea of its real magnitude) with the goodness of God. Mr. Mill repudiates the explanatory hypothesis tendered by Mr. Mansel as a solution, but without suggesting any better hypothesis of his own. For ourselves, we are far from endorsing Mr. Mansel's solution as satisfactory; yet we can hardly be surprised if he considers it less unsatisfactory than no solution at all. And when we reflect how frequently and familiarly predicates applicable to man are applied to the Supreme Being, when they cannot possibly be understood about Him in the same sense – we see no ground for treating the proceeding as disingenuous, which Mr. Mill is disposed to do. Indeed, it cannot easily be avoided: and Mr. Mill himself furnishes us with some examples in the present volume. At page 491, he says:—

"It would be difficult to find a stronger argument in favour of Theism, than that the eye must have been made by one who sees, and the ear by one who hears."

In the words here employed, *seeing* and *hearing* are predicated of God.

Now when we predicate of men, that they *see* or *hear*, we affirm facts of extreme complexity, especially in the case of *seeing;* facts partly physical, partly mental, involving multifarious movements and agencies of nerves, muscles, and other parts of the organism, together with direct sensational impressions, and mental reconstruction of the past, inseparably associated therewith; all which, so far as they are known, are perspicuously enumerated in the work of Professor Bain* on the "Senses and the Intellect." Again, Mr. Mill speaks (in p. 102 and elsewhere) of "the veracity of God." When we say of our neighbour that he is a veracious man, we ascribe to him a habit of speaking the truth; that is, of employing his physical apparatus of speech, and his mental power of recalling and recombining words lodged in the memory, for the purpose of asserting no other propositions except such as declare facts which he knows, or beliefs which he really entertains. But how either *seeing* or *hearing* or *veracity*, in these senses, can be predicated of God, we are at a loss to understand. And if they are to be predicated of God in a different sense, this admits the same license as Mr. Mansel contends for in respect to Goodness, when he feels that undeniable facts preclude him from predicating that epithet univocally respecting God and respecting man.†

On the whole, it seems to us, that though Mr. Mill will consent to worship only a God of perfect goodness, he has thrown no new light on the grave problem—frankly stated, though imperfectly solved, by Mr. Mansel—how such a conception of God is to be reconciled with the extent of evil and suffering actually pervading human life and animal life throughout the earth. We are compelled to say, respecting Mr. Mill's treatment of this subject—what we should not say respecting his treatment of any other—that he has left an old perplexing problem not less perplexing than he found it.

Reverting, not unwillingly, from theology to philosophy, we now pass on to Mr. Mill's ninth chapter (p. 128 seq.), of the Interpretation of Consciousness. There is assuredly no lesson more requiring to be taught than the proper mode of conducting such interpretation; for the number of different modes in which Consciousness has been interpreted is astonishing. Mr. Mill begins by citing from Sir W. Hamilton's lectures a passage of some length, upon which he bestows considerable praise, regarding it as—

"One of the proofs that, whatever may be the positive value of his (Sir W. Hamilton's) achievements in metaphysics, he had a greater capacity for the subject than many metaphysicians of high reputation; and particularly than his two distinguished predecessors in the same school of thought—'Reid and Stewart.'"—p. 131.

This is one of the greatest compliments to

* Herodot. t. 32. Ω Κρῆσε, ἐπιστάμενον με τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἐὸν φθονερόν τε καὶ ταραχῶδες, ἐπειρωτᾷς ἀνθρωπηίων πραγμάτων πέρι; also iii. 40.

† See Eurip. Hipp. 6-96-140. The language of the attendant, after his affectionate remonstrance to Hippolytus had been disregarded, supplicating Aphrodite to pardon the recalcitrancy of that virtuous but obstinate youth, is characteristic and touching (114-120).

* See especially his chapter ii. on the Sensations of Sight, pp. 222, 241—247, in the second edition of this work.

† Descartes says, in his "Principia Philosophiæ," i. 51—"Et quidem substantia quæ nullâ planè re indigeat, unica tantum potest intelligi—nempe Deus. Alias vero omnes, non nisi ope concursûs Dei existere posse perspicimus. Atque ideò nomen substantiæ non convenit Deo et illis *univocè*, ut dici solet in scholis; hoc est, nulla ejus nominis significatio potest distinctè intelligi, quæ Deo et creaturis sit communis."

Sir W. Hamilton that the book contains, and as such we are glad to cite it.

On the subject of Consciousness, Mr. Mill has cited from Sir W. Hamilton other good observations besides the one last alluded to; but, unfortunately, these are often neutralised by opposite or inconsistent opinions also cited from other parts of his works. The number of such inconsistencies produced is indeed one remarkable feature in Sir. W. Hamilton's philosophical character. He seems to follow out energetically (as Plato in his various dialogues) the vein of thought pervading his mind at each particular moment, without troubling himself to look back upon his own prior speculations. Even compared with the best views of Sir W. Hamilton, however, Mr. Mill's mode of handling the subject of Consciousness exhibits signal improvement. To some of his observations we shall call particular attention.

All philosophers agree that what Consciousness testifies is to be believed; but they differ much on the question—To what points Consciousness does testify? and even on the still deeper question—How shall we proceed to ascertain what *are* these attested points? What is the proper method of studying or interrogating Consciousness? Upon this Mr. Mill remarks (pp. 145—147).—

"Here emerges the distinction between two different methods of studying the problems of metaphysics; forming the radical difference between the two great schools into which metaphysicians are divided. One of these I shall call, for distinction, the *introspective* method; the other, the *psychological*. M. Cousin observes that Locke went wrong from the beginning, by placing before himself, as the question to be first resolved, the origin of our ideas. This (he says) was commencing at the wrong end. The proper course would have been to begin by determining what the ideas now are; to ascertain what it is that Consciousness now tells us; postponing till afterwards the attempt to frame a theory concerning the origin of any of the mental phenomena.

"I accept the question as M. Cousin states it; and I contend that no attempt to determine what are the direct revelations of Consciousness can be successful, or entitled to any regard, unless preceded by what M. Cousin says ought only to follow it—an enquiry into the origin of our acquired ideas. For we have it not in our power to ascertain, by any direct process, what Consciousness told us at the time when its revelations were in their pristine purity. It only offers itself to our inspection as it exists now, when those original revelations are overlaid and buried under a mountainous heap of acquired notions and perceptions.

"It seems to M. Cousin, that if we examine, with care and minuteness, our present states of Consciousness, distinguishing and defining every ingredient which we find to enter into them—every element that we seem to recognise as real, and cannot by merely concentrating our attention upon it analyse into anything simpler—we reach the ultimate and primary truths, which are the sources of all our knowledge, and which cannot be denied or doubted without denying or doubting the evidence of Consciousness itself—that is, the only evidence that there is for anything. I maintain this to be a misconception of the conditions imposed on enquirers by the difficulties of psychological investigation. To begin the enquiry at the point where M. Cousin takes it up is, in fact, to beg the question. For he must be aware, if not of the fact, at least of the belief of his opponents, that the laws of the mind—the laws of Association, according to one class of thinkers, the Categories of the Understanding according to another—are capable of creating, out of those data of Consciousness which are uncontested, purely mental conceptions, which become so identified in thought with all our states of Consciousness that *we seem, and cannot but seem, to receive them by direct intuition*. For example, the belief in Matter, in the opinion of these thinkers is, or at least may be, thus produced:—

"'The proof that any of the alleged Universal Beliefs, or Principles of Common Sense, are affirmations of Consciousness—supposes two things: that the beliefs exist, and that they cannot possibly have been acquired. The first is, in most cases, undisputed; but the second is a subject of enquiry which often taxes the utmost resources of psychologists. Locke was therefore right in believing that 'the origin of our ideas' is the main stress of the problem of mental science, and the subject which must be first considered in forming the theory of the Mind.'"

This citation from Mr. Mill's book is already almost too long, yet we could have wished to prolong it still more, from the importance of some of the succeeding paragraphs. It presents, in clear discrimination and contrast, two opposite points of view according to which the phenomena of mind are regarded by different philosophers, and the method of studying them determined: the *introspective* method, adopted by M. Cousin and others—the *psychological* or analytical method, pursued by Locke and by many other eminent men since Locke—"the known and approved method of physical science, adapted to the necessities of psychology"—(p. 148.)

There are passages of Sir W. Hamilton's writings in which he appears to feel that the *introspective* method alone is insufficient for the interpretation of Consciousness, and that the analytical method must be employed to reinforce it. But on this as on other points, he is not always consistent with himself. For in laying down the principle upon which the primary truths of Consciousness, the original data of intelligence, are to be ascertained and distinguished from generalizations out of experience and custom, he declares that the one single and certain mark is Necessity—they must be beliefs which we are under the necessity of believing—of which we cannot get rid by any mental effort. He decides this, of course, for himself, by the *introspective* method alone. He (with M. Cousin and other philosophers who take the same view) does not apply the analytical method to enquire whether his necessity of belief may not be a purely acquired necessity, and nowise congenital. It is, indeed, remarkable that these philosophers do not even seek to apply the introspective method as far as that method will really go. They are satisfied with introspection of their own present minds, without obtaining results of the like process, as applied to other minds, in different times and places. They declare various beliefs to be necessary to the human mind universally, merely because such is the actual fact with their own minds and with those immediately around them; sometimes even in

defiance of proof that there are (or have been) persons not sharing such beliefs, and occasionally even believing the contrary; therefore, when even the introspective method really disallows their affirmative instead of sustaining it. This is, in truth, an abuse of the introspective method; yet, even if that method were employed in its fullest extent—if the same incapability of believing otherwise could be shown as common to all mankind—it might still be only the effect of a strong association. The analytical method must still be called in to ascertain whether we are forced to suppose such incapability to be an original fact of consciousness, or whether it may not have been generated in the mind by circumstances, under the natural working of the laws of association. It is certain that these laws not only may, but must, give birth to artificial inconceivabilities in the mind—and that some of these may be equal in strength to such, if any, as are natural.

"The History of Science" (says Mr. Mill, following out the same train of reasoning which we read in the third Book of his 'System of Logic') "teems with inconceivabilities which have been conquered; and with supposed necessary truths, which have first ceased to be thought necessary, then to be thought true, and have finally come to be deemed impossible."—p. 150.

After various observations, chiefly exhibiting the rashness of many censures bestowed by Sir W. Hamilton on Brown, Mr. Mill gives us three valuable chapters (xi., xii., xiii.), wherein he analyses the Belief in an External World, the Belief in Mind as a separate Substance or Noumenon, and the Primary Qualities of Matter. To each of these topics he applies what he calls the *psychological* method, as contrasted with the simply *introspective* method of Sir W. Hamilton (the Ego and Non-Ego affirmed to be given together in the primary deliverance of Consciousness) and so many other philosophers. He proves that these beliefs are noway intuitive, but acquired products; and that the known laws of Association are sufficient to explain how they are acquired; especially the Law of Inseparable Association, together with that of *Obliviscence*—a very useful, discriminating phrase, which we first find employed in this volume—(p. 259 et passim.) He defines Matter to be a *permanent possibility of Sensation;* he maintains that this is really all which (apart from philosophical theories) mankind in general mean by it; he shows that mere possibilities of sensation not only may, but must, according to the known Laws of Association, come to present "to our artificialized Consciousness" a character of objectivity—(pp. 198, 199.) The correlating subject, though present in fact and indispensable, is eliminated out of conscious notice, according to the Law of Obliviscence.

These chapters will well repay the most careful perusal. We can only find room for one passage (pp. 214, 215):—

"Throughout the whole of our sensitive life, except its first beginnings, we unquestionably refer our sensations to a *me* and a *not-me*. As soon as I have formed, on the one hand, the notion of Permanent Possibilities of Sensation, and on the other, of that continued series of feelings which I call my life—both these notions are, by an irresistible association, recalled by every sensation I have. They represent two things, with both of which the sensation of the moment, be it what it may, stands in relation; and I cannot be conscious of the sensation without being conscious of it, as related to these two things. They have accordingly received relative names, expressive of the double relation in question. The thread of consciousness which I apprehend the relation as a part of, is called the *Subject;* the group of Permanent Possibilities of Sensation to which I refer it, and which is partially realised and actualised in it, is called the *Object* of the sensation. The sensation itself ought to have a correlative name, or rather ought to have two such names—one denoting the sensation as opposed to its Subject, the other denoting it as opposed to its Object; but it is a remarkable fact that this necessity has not been felt, and that the need of a correlative name to every relative one has been considered to be satisfied by the terms Object and Subject themselves. It is true that these two are related to one another, but only through the sensation. We have no conception of either Subject or Object, either Mind or Matter, except as something to which we refer our sensations, and whatever other feelings we are conscious of. *The very existence of them both, so far as cognisable by us, consists only in the relation they respectively bear to our states of feeling.* Their relation to each other is only the relation between those two relations. The immediate correlatives are, not the pair, *Object, Subject*, but the two pairs, Object, *Sensation objectively considered*—Subject, *Sensation subjectively considered*. The reason why this is overlooked might easily be shewn, and would furnish a good illustration of that important part of the Laws of Association, which may be termed the Laws of Obliviscence."

This chapter, on the Primary Qualities of Matter, controverts the opinion of Sir W. Hamilton, that extension, as consisting of coexistent *partes extra partes*, is immediately and necessarily apprehended by our consciousness. It cites, as well as confirms, the copious proof given by Professor Bain (in his work on the Senses and the Intellect) that our conception of extension is derived from our muscular sensibility: that our sensation of *muscular motion unimpeded* constitutes our notion of empty space, as our sensation of *muscular motion impeded* constitutes that of filled space: that our conception of extension, as an aggregate of coexistent parts, arises from the sense of sight, which comprehends a great number of parts in a succession so rapid as to be confounded with simultaneity—and which not only becomes the symbol of muscular and tactile succession, but even acquires such ascendancy as to supersede both of them in our consciousness. Confirmation is here given to this important doctrine, not merely by observations from Mr. Mill himself, but also from the very curious narrative, discovered and produced by Sir W. Hamilton, out of a work of the German philosopher, Platner. Platner instituted a careful examination of a man born blind, and ascertained that this man did not conceive extension as an aggregate of simultaneous parts, but as a series of sensations experienced or to be experienced in succession—(pp. 232, 233.) The case reported from Platner both corroborates the theory of Professor Bain,

and receives its proper interpretation from that theory; while it is altogether adverse to the doctrine of Sir W. Hamilton—as is also another case, which he cites from Maine de Biran:—

"It gives a very favourable idea of Sir W. Hamilton's sincerity and devotion to truth (remarks Mr. Mill, p. 247) that he should have drawn from obscurity, and made generally known, two cases so unfavourable to his own opinions."

We think this remark perfectly just; and we would point out besides, in appreciating Sir W. Hamilton's merits, that his appetite for facts was useful to philosophy, as well as his appetite for speculation. But the person whose usefulness to philosophy we prefer to bring into the foreground, is Platner himself. He spent three weeks in patient examination of this blind man, and the tenor of his report proves that his sagacity in interpreting facts was equal to his patience in collecting them. The rarity of all such careful and premeditated observation of the facts of mind, appears to us one main reason why (what Mr. Mills calls) the *psychological* theory finds so little acceptance; and why those who maintain that what now seems a mental integer was once a multiplicity of separate mental fragments, can describe the antecedent steps of the change only as a *latens processus*, which the reader never fully understands, and often will not admit. Every man's mind is gradually built up from infancy to maturity; the process is always going on before our eyes, yet the stages of it—especially the earliest stages, the most pregnant with instruction—are never studied and put on record by observers trained in Inductive logic, knowing beforehand what they ought to look for as the *sine quâ non* for proving or disproving any proposed theory. Such cases as that cited by Platner—cases of one marked congenital defect of sense, enabling us to apply the Method of Difference—are always within reach; but few Platners are found to scrutinise and record them. Historians of science describe to us the laborious and multiplied observations, and the elaborate precautions for ensuring accuracy of observation, which recent chemical and physical enquirers have found indispensable for the establishing of their results. We cannot, therefore, be surprised that mental phllosophers, dealing with facts even more obscure, and careless about enlarging, varying, authenticating their records of particular facts, should have had little success in establishing any results at all.

But if even those who adopt the psychological theory, have been remiss in the observation of particular mental facts, those who deny the theory have been far more than remiss; they have been blind to obvious facts contradicting the principles which they lay down. Mr. Mill, in chap. xiv., deals with this denial, common to Mr. Mansel with Sir W. Hamilton. That philosophers so eminent as both of them should declare confidently—"what I cannot but think, must be *d priori*, or original to thought; it cannot be engendered by experience upon custom" (p. 264), appears to us as extraordinary as it does to Mr. Mill. Though no one ever surpassed Sir W. Hamilton in large acquaintance with the actual diversities of human belief, and human incapacities of believing—yet he never seems to have thought of bringing this acquaintance into account, when he assured the students in his lecture-room that custom, experience, indissoluble association, were altogether insufficient to engender a felt necessity of believing. Such forgetfulness of well-known mental facts cannot be reproached to the advocates of the psychological theory.

In chap. xv., Mr. Mill examines Sir. W. Hamilton's doctrine on unconscious mental modifications. He points out the confused manner in which Sir W. Hamilton has conceived *mental latency*, as well as the inconclusive character of the reasoning whereby he refutes the following doctrine of Dugald Stewart—That in the most rapid trains of association, each separate item must have been successively present to consciousness, though for a time too short to leave any memory. Sir W. Hamilton thinks that the separate items may pass, and often do pass, unconsciously; which opinion Mr. Mill also, though not approving his reasons, is inclined to adopt.

"I am myself inclined (p. 285) to admit unconscious mental modifications, in the only sense in which I can attach any very distinct meaning to them—namely, unconscious modifications of the nerves. It may well be believed that the apparently suppressed links in a chain of association, those which Sir W. Hamilton considers as latent, really are so: that they are not even momentarily felt, the chain of causation being continued only physically—by one organic state of the nerves succeeding another so rapidly, that the state of mental consciousness appropriate to each is not produced."

Mr. Mill gives various illustrations in support of this doctrine. He at the same time calls attention to a valuable lecture of Sir W. Hamilton's, the thirty-second lecture on Metaphysics; especially to the instructive citation from Cardaillac contained therein, noting the important fact, which descriptions of the Law of Association often keep out of sight—that the suggestive agency of Association is carried on, not by single antecedents raising up single consequents, but by a mass of antecedents raising up simultaneously a mass of consequents, among which attention is very unequally distributed.

We shall say little upon Mr. Mill's remarks on Sir W. Hamilton's Theory of Causation—(chap. xvi.) This theory appears to Mr. Mill absurd; while the theory of Mr. Mill (continued from Hume, Brown, and James Mill) on the same subject appears to Sir W. Hamilton insufficient and unsatisfactory—"professing to explain the phenomenon of causality, but previously to explanation, evacuating the phenomenon of all that desiderates explanation"—(p. 295.) For ourselves, we embrace the theory of Mr. Mill:* yet we are aware that the remark just

* At the same time we cannot go along with Mr. Mill in the following affirmation (p. 201):—

"This natural probability is converted into certainty when we take into consideration that universal law of our experience which is termed the law of Causation, and which makes us *unable to conceive the*

cited from Sir W. Hamilton represents the dissatisfaction entertained towards it by many objectors. The unscientific and anti-scientific yearnings prevalent among mankind lead them to put questions which no sound theory of Causation will answer; and they are ready to visit and trust any oracle which professes to deliver a confident affirmative solution of such questions. Among all the terms employed by metaphysicians, none is used in a greater variety of meanings than the term Cause.

In Mr. Mill's next chapter, (xvi.) he comments on Sir W. Hamilton's doctrine of Concepts or General Notions. There are portions of this chapter with which we agree less than with most other parts of the volume; especially with his marked hostility to the term *Concept*, and the reasons given for it; which reasons appear to us not very consistent with what he has himself said in the "System of Logic," Book IV. ch. ii. § 1—3. The term *Concept* has no necessary connexion with the theory called Conceptualism. It is equally available to designate the idea called up by a general name, as understood either by Mr. Bailey or by James Mill. We think it useful as an equivalent to the German word *Begriff*, which sense Sir W. Hamilton has in view when he introduces it, though he does not always adhere to his profession. And when Mr. Mill says (p. 331)—

> "I consider it nothing less than a misfortune, that the words Concept, General Notion, or any other phrase to express the supposed mental modification corresponding to a general name, should ever have been invented,"

we dissent from his opinion. To talk of "the Concept of an individual," however, as Mr. Mansel does (pp. 338, 339), is improper and inconsistent with the purpose for which the name is given.

We are more fully in harmony with Mr. Mill in his two next chapters (xviii. et seq.) on Judgment and Reasoning; which are among the best chapters in the volume. He there combats and overthrows the theory of Reasoning laid down by Sir W. Hamilton; but we doubt the propriety of his calling this "the Conceptualist theory" (pp. 367, 368); since it has nothing to do with Conceptualism, in the special sense of antithesis to Realism and Nominalism,—but is, in fact, the theory of the Syllogism as given in the Analytics of Aristotle, and generally admitted since. Not merely Conceptualists, but (to use Mr. Mill's own language, p. 366) "nearly all the writers on logic, taught a theory of the science too small and narrow to contain their own facts." Such, indeed, was the theory constantly taught until the publication of Mr. Mill's "System of Logic;" the first two books of which corrected it, by arguments which are reinforced and amplified in these two chapters on Judgment and Reasoning, as well as in the two chapters next following—chaps. xx. and xxi.—("Is Logic the Science of the Forms of Thought—On the Fundamental Laws of Thought.") The contrast which is there presented, in many different ways, between the limited theory of logic taught by Sir W. Hamilton and Mr. Mansel, and the enlarged theory of Mr. Mill, is instructive in a high degree. We consider Mr. Mill as the real preserver of all that is valuable in Formal Logic from the unfortunate consequences of an erroneous estimate, brought upon it through the exaggerated pretensions of logicians. When Sir W. Hamilton contrasts it pointedly with physical science (of which he talks with a sort of supercilious condescension, in one of the worst passages of his writings, p. 401)—when all its apparent fruits were produced in the shape of ingenious but barren verbal technicalities, what hope could be entertained that Formal Logic could hold its ground in the estimation of the recent generation of scientific men? Mr. Mill has divested it of that assumed demonstrative authority which Bacon called "regere res per syllogismum;" but he has at the same time given to it a firm root amidst the generalities of objective science. He has shown that in the great problem of Evidence or Proof, the Laws of Formal Logic, though bearing only on one part of the entire procedure, yet bear upon one essential part, proper to be studied separately; and that the maintenance of consistency between our affirmations (which is the only special province of Formal Logic) has great importance and value as a part of the process necessary for ascertaining and vindicating their truth, or exposing their character when false or uncertified—but no importance and value, except as a part of that larger exigency.

While Mr. Mill was amending the Syllogistic theory so as to ensure for Formal Logic its legitimate place among the essentials of scientific procedure, Sir W. Hamilton was at the same time enlarging it on its technical side, in two modes which are highly esteemed both by himself and by others: 1. The recognition of two kinds of Syllogisms; one in Extension, the other in Comprehension; 2. The doctrine of the Quantification of the Predicate. Both

---

beginning of anything without an antecedent condition *or cause.*"

Such "inability to conceive" appears to us not in correspondence with facts. First, it cannot be properly either affirmed or denied, until agreement is obtained, what the word *cause* means. If three persons, A, B, and C, agree in affirming it—A adopting the meaning of Aristotle, B that of Sir William Hamilton, and C that of Mr. Mill—the agreement is purely verbal; or rather, all three concur in having a mental exigency pressing for satisfaction, but differ as to the hypothesis which satisfies it.

Next, if we reason upon Mr. Mill's theory as to Cause, certainly those who deny his theory can have no difficulty in conceiving events without any cause (in that sense); nor have those who adopt his theory any greater difficulty. These last *believe* that there are, throughout, constant and uniform conditions on which the occurrence of every event depends; but they can perfectly *conceive* events as occurring without any such uniform sequence. In truth, the belief in such causation, as pervading *all nature*, is an acquired result of scientific training. The greater part of mankind believe that some events occur in regular, others in irregular, succession. Moreover, a full half of the metaphysical world espouse the doctrine of free-will, and consider that all volitions occur without any cause at all.

these novelties are here criticised by Mr. Mill in chapter xxii., which we recommend the reader to peruse conjointly with Lectures 15 and 16 of Sir W. Hamilton on Logic.

Now whereas the main objection, by which the study of the syllogistic logic has been weighed down and discredited in modern times, is this, that it encumbers the memory with formal distinctions, having no useful application to the real process and purposes of reasoning — the procedure of Sir W. Hamilton might almost lead us to imagine that he himself was trying to aggravate that objection to the uttermost. He introduces a variety of new canons (classifying Syllogisms as Extensive and Intensive, by a distinction founded on the double quantity of notions, in Extension and in Comprehension) which he intimates that all former logicians have neglected—while it plainly appears, even on his own showing, that the difference between syllogisms, in respect to these two sorts of quantity, is of no practical value; and that "we can always change a categorical syllogism of the one quantity into a categorical syllogism of the other by reversing the order of the two premises, and by reversing the meaning of the copula" (Lect. xvi. p. 296); nay, that every syllogism is already a syllogism in both quantities (Mill, p. 431). Against these useless ceremonial reforms of Sir W. Hamilton, we may set the truly philosophical explanation here given by Mr. Mill of the meaning of propositions.

"All judgments (he says—p. 423), except where both the terms are proper names, are really judgments in Comprehension; though it is customary, and the natural tendency of the mind, to express most of them in terms of Extension. In other words, we never really predicate anything but attributes; though, in the usage of language, we commonly predicate them by means of words which are names of concrete objects—because" (p. 426)—"we have no other convenient and compact mode of speaking. Most attributes, and nearly all large bundles of attributes, have no names of their own. We can only name them by a circumlocution. We are accustomed to speak of attributes, not by names given to themselves, but by means of the names which they give to the objects they are attributes of." "All our ordinary judgments (p. 428) are in Comprehension only; Extension not being thought of. But we may, if we please, make the Extension of our general terms an express object of thought. When I judge that all oxen ruminate, I have nothing in my thoughts but the attributes and their coexistence. But when by reflection I perceive what the proposition implies, I remark that other things may ruminate besides oxen, and that the unknown multitude of things that ruminate form a mass, with which the unknown multitude of things having the attributes of oxen is either identical or is wholly comprised in it. Which of these two is the truth I may not know, and if I did, took no notice of it when I assented to the proposition, all oxen ruminate; but I perceive, on consideration, that one or other of them must be true. Though I had not this in my mind when I affirmed that all oxen ruminate, I can have it now; I can make the concrete objects denoted by each of the two names an object of thought, as a collective though indefinite aggregate; in other words, I can make the Extension of the names (or notions) an object of direct consciousness. When I do this, I perceive that this operation introduces no new fact, but is only a different mode of contemplating the very fact which I had previously expressed by the words, all oxen ruminate. The fact is the same, but the mode of contemplating it is different. There is thus in all Propositions a judgment concerning attributes (called by Sir W. Hamilton a Judgment in Comprehension) which we make as a matter of course; and a possible judgment in or concerning Extension, which we *may* make, and which will be true if the former is true."

From the lucid explanation here cited (and from a following paragraph too long to transcribe, p. 433), we see that there is no real distinction between Judgments in Comprehension and Judgments in Extension; that the *appearance* of distinction between them arises from the customary mode of enunciation, which custom is here accounted for; that the addition to the theory of the Syllogism, for which Sir W. Hamilton takes credit, is alike troublesome and unprofitable.

The like may also be said about his other innovation, the Quantification of the Predicate. Still more extensive are the changes (as stated by himself) which this innovation would introduce in the canons of Syllogism. Indeed, when we read his langurge (Appendix to "Lectures on Logic," pp. 291—297) censuring generally the prior logicians from Aristotle downwards, and contending that "more than half the value of logic had been lost" by their manner of handling it—we may appreciate the magnitude of the reform which he believed himself to be introducing. The larger the reform, the more it behoved him to be sure of the ground on which he was proceeding. But on this point we remark a serious deficiency. After laying down, with appropriate emphasis, the valuable logical postulate, *to state explicitly what is thought implicitly*, on which, Sir W. Hamilton says,

"Logic ever insists, but which logicians have never fairly obeyed—it follows that logically we ought to take into account the quantity, *always understood in thought*, but usually, and for manifest reasons, elided in expression, not only of the *subject*, but also of the *predicate* of a judgment."—("Discussions on Philos." p. 614.)

Here Sir W. Hamilton assumes that the quantity of the predicate is always understood in thought; and the same assumption is often repeated, in the Appendix to his "Lectures on Logic," p. 291 and elsewhere, as if it was alike obvious and incontestable. Now it is precisely on this point that issue is here taken with Sir W. Hamilton. Mr. Mill denies altogether (p. 437) that the quantity of the predicate is always understood or present in thought, and appeals to every reader's consciousness for an answer:—

"Does he, when he judges that all oxen ruminate, advert even in the minutest degree to the question, whether there is anything else that ruminates? Is this consideration at all in his thoughts, any more than any other consideration foreign to the immediate subject? One person may know that there are other ruminating animals, another may think

there are none, a third may be without any opinion on the subject; but if they all know what is meant by ruminating, they all, when they judge that every ox ruminates, mean precisely the same thing. The mental process they go through, *as far as that one judgment is concerned*, is precisely identical; though some of them may go on farther, and *add other judgments* to it."

The last sentence cited from Mr. Mill indicates the vice of Sir W. Hamilton's proceeding in quantifying the predicate, and explains why it was that logicians before him declined to do so. Sir W. Hamilton, in this proceeding, insists on stating explicitly, not merely all that is thought implicitly, but a great deal more;* adding to it something else, which *may*, indeed, be thought conjointly, but which more frequently *is not* thought at all. He requires us to pack two distinct judgments into one and the same proposition: he interpolates the meaning of the Propositio Conversa *simpliciter* into the form of the Propositio Convertenda (when an universal Affirmative), and then claims it as a great advantage, that the proposition thus interpolated admits of being converted *simpliciter*, and not merely *per accidens*. Mr. Mill is, nevertheless, of opinion (pp. 439—443) that though "the quantified syllogism is not a true expression of what is in thought, yet writing the predicate with a quantification may be sometimes a real help to the Art of Logic." We see little advantage in providing a new complicated form, for the purpose of expressing in one proposition what naturally throws itself into two, and may easily be expressed in two. If a man is prepared to give us information on one Quæsitum, why should he be constrained to use a mode of speech which forces on his attention at the same time a second and distinct Quæsitum—so that he must either give us information about the two at once, or confess himself ignorant respecting the second?

The two next chapters of Mr. Mill, noticing some other minor peculiarities (all of them unfortunate, and one, p. 447, really unaccountable) of Sir W. Hamilton's Formal Logic; and some Fallacious Modes of Thought countenanced by Sir W. Hamilton (chs. xxiii., xxiv.—pp. 446, 478), we are compelled to pass over. We must find space, however, for a few words on the Freedom of the Will (ch. xxv.), which (in Mr. Mill's language, pp. 488—549), "was so fundamental with Sir W. Hamilton, that it may be regarded as the central idea of his system—the determining cause of most of his philosophical opinions." Prior to Sir W. Hamilton, we find some writers who maintain the doctrine of Free-will, others who maintain that of Necessity: each supporting their respective conclusions by reasons which they deem sufficient. Sir W. Hamilton declares that both the one doctrine and the other are inconceivable and incomprehensible; yet that, by the law of Excluded Middle, one or other of them must be true; and he decides in favour of Free-will, of which he believes himself to be distinctly conscious; moreover, Free-will is essential (he thinks) to moral responsibility, of which also he feels himself conscious. He confesses himself, however, unable to explain the possibility of Free-will; but he maintains that the same may be said about Necessity also. "The champions of both the two opposite doctrines are at once resistless in attack, and impotent in defence"—(Hamilton's "Footnotes on Reid," p. 602.) Mr. Mansel also asserts, even more confidently than Sir W. Hamilton, that we are directly conscious of Free-will—(p. 503.)

Sir W. Hamilton has himself given some of the best arguments against the doctrine of Free-will, in refutation of Reid: arguments, some of which are here cited by Mr. Mill with praise which they well deserve—(pp. 497, 498.) But Mr. Mill's own reasoning on the same side is of a still higher order, enlarging the grounds previously urged in the last book of his "System of Logic." He protests against the term *Necessity*; and discards the idea of Necessity, if it be understood to imply anything more than invariability of antecedence and consequence. If it mean *that*, experience proves thus much about antecedents in the world of mind, as in the world of matter: if it mean more, experience does not prove more, either in the world of matter or in the world of mind: nor have we any grounds for affirming it in either—(p. 501.) If it were true, therefore, that consciousness attested Free-will, we should find the testimony of consciousness opposed to a full proof from experience and induction. But does consciousness really attest what is called Free-will? Mr. Mill analyses the case, and declares in the negative.

"To be conscious of Free-will, must mean to be conscious, before I have decided, that I am able to decide either way; exception may be taken *in limine*

---

* Among the various authorities (upon this question of quantifying the predicate) collected by Sir W. Hamilton in the valuable Appendix to his "Lectures on Logic," we find one (p. 311) which takes the same ground of objection as Mr. Mill, in these words:—"The cause why the quantitative note is not usually joined with the predicate, is, that there would thus be two *quæsita* at once; to wit, whether the predicate were affirmed of the subject, and whether it were denied of everything beside. For when we say, *all man is all rational*, we judge that *all man is rational*, and judge likewise *that rational is denied of everything but man*. But these are, in reality, two different *quæsita*; and therefore it has become usual to state them, not in one, but in two several propositions. And this is self-evident, seeing that a *quæsitum*, in itself, asks only—*Does or does not this inhere in that?* and *not* Does or does not this inhere in that, *and at the same time inhere in nothing else?*"

The author of this just and sagacious remark—much surpassing what the other writers quoted in the Appendix say—was a Jew who died at Perpignan in or near 1370, named Levi Ben Gerson or Gersonides. An interesting account of this man, eminent as a writer and thinker in his age, will be found in a biography by Dr. Joel, published at Breslau in 1862, "Levi Ben Gerson als Religions philosophs." He distinguished himself as a writer on theology, philosophy, and astronomy; he was one of the successors to the free speculative vein of Maimonides, and one of the continuators of the Arabic Aristotelian philosophy. He both commented on and combated the doctrine of Averroes. Dr. Joel thinks that he died earlier than 1370.

to the use of the word *consciousness* in such an application. Consciousness tells me what I do or feel. But what am I *able* to do, is not a subject of consciousness. Consciousness is not prophetic; we are conscious of what is, not of what will or can be. We never know that we are able to do a thing, except from having done it, or something similar to it. Having acted, we know, as far as that experience reaches, how we are able to act; *and this knowledge, when it has become familiar, is often confounded with, and called by, the name of consciousness.* But it does not derive any increase of authority from being misnamed: its truth is not supreme over, but depends upon, experience. If our so-called consciousness is not borne out by experience, it is a delusion. It has no title to credence, but as an interpretation of experience; and if it is a false interpretation it must give way."—pp. 503, 504.

After this salutary and much-needed warning against the confusion between consciousness as an infallible authority, and belief upon experience, of which we are conscious as a belief —Mr. Mill proceeds to sift the alleged self-evident connexion between Free-will and Accountability. He shows, not merely that there is no connexion, but that there is a positive repugnance between the two. By Free-will is meant that a volition is not determined by motives, but is a spontaneous mental fact, neither having a cause, nor admitting of being predicted. Now, the very reason for giving notice that we intend to punish certain acts, and for inflicting punishment if the acts be committed, is, that we trust in the efficacy of the threat and the punishment as deterring motives. If the volition of agents be not influenced by motives, the whole machinery of law becomes unavailing, and punishment a purposeless infliction of pain. In fact, it is on that very ground that the madman is exempted from punishment; his volition being presumed to be not capable of being acted upon by the deterring motive of legal sanction. The *free* agent, thus understood, is one who can neither feel himself accountable, nor be rendered accountable, to or by others. It is only the *necessary* agent (the person whose volitions are determined by motives, and, in case of conflict, by the strongest desire or the strongest apprehension) that can be held really accountable, or can feel himself to be so.

"The true doctrine of the Causation of human actions (says Mr. Mill, p. 516) maintains, in opposition both to pure and to modified Fatalism, that not only our conduct, but our character is in part amenable to our will: that we can, by employing the proper means, improve our character: and that if our character is such that, while it remains what it is, it necessitates us to do wrong—it will be just to apply motives which will necessitate us to strive for its improvement. We shall not indeed do so unless we desire our improvement, and desire it more than we dislike the means which must be employed for the purpose."

It thus appears that of the two propositions, 1, volitions are necessary, or depend on causes; 2, volitions are free, or do not depend on causes —neither the one nor the other is inconceivable or incomprehensible, as Sir W. Hamilton supposed them to be. That the first is true, and the second false, we learn by experience, and by that alone; just as we learn the like in regard to the phenomena of the material world. Indeed, the fact that human volitions are both predictable and modifiable, quite as much as all those physical phenomena that depend upon a complication of causes—which is only a corollary from what has just been said—is so universally recognised and acted upon by all men, that there would probably be little difference of opinion about this question, if the antithesis were not obscured and mystified by the familiar, but equivocal, phrases of Free-will and Necessity.

Passing over chapter xxvii., in which Mr. Mill refutes Sir W. Hamilton's opinion that the study of mathematics is worthless, or nearly so, as an intellectual discipline—we shall now call attention to the concluding remarks which sum up the results of the volume. After saying that he "differs from almost everything in Sir W. Hamilton's philosophy, on which he particularly valued himself, or which is specially his own," Mr. Mill describes Sir W. Hamilton's general merits as follows:—

"They chiefly consist in his clear and distinct mode of bringing before the reader many of the fundamental questions of metaphysics: some good specimens of psychological analysis on a small scale: and the many detached logical and psychological truths which he has separately seized, and which are scattered through his writings, mostly applied to resolve some special difficulty, and again lost sight of. I can hardly point to anything he has done towards helping the more thorough understanding of the greater mental phenomena, unless it be his theory of Attention (including Abstraction), which seems to me the most perfect we have; but the subject, though a highly important, is comparatively a simple one."—p. 547.

Agreeing in this general view of Sir W. Hamilton's merits, we should be disposed to describe them in language stronger and more emphatic as to degree, than that which has just been cited. But what is stated in the pages immediately following (pp. 550, 551)—That Sir W. Hamilton's doctrines appear to be usually taken up under the stimulus of some special dispute and often afterwards forgotten; That he did not think out subjects until they were thoroughly mastered, or until consistency was attained between the different views which the author took from different points of observation; That, accordingly, his philosophy seems made up of scraps from several conflicting metaphysical systems—All this is literally and amply borne out by the many inconsistencies and contradictions which Mr. Mill has brought to view in the preceding chapters. It would appear that the controversial disposition was powerful with Sir W. Hamilton, and that a present impulse of that sort (as has been said respecting Bayle, Burke, and others) not only served to provoke new intellectual combinations in his mind, but also exercised a Lethæan influence in causing obliviscence of the old. But we can hardly follow Mr. Mill in ascribing the defect to "excessive absorption of time and energy by the study of old writers" (p. 551).

If this study did no other good, it at least kept the memory in exercise. Now, what surprises us most in Sir W. Hamilton's inconsistencies, is the amount of self-forgetfulness which they imply.

While the laborious erudition of Sir W. Hamilton cannot be fairly regarded as having produced any of his intellectual defects, it undoubtedly stamped upon him his special title of excellence as a philosopher. This is fully recognised by Mr. Mill; though he treats it as belonging not so much to a philosopher as to an historian of philosophy. He concludes (pp. 552—554):—

"It is much to be regretted that Sir W. Hamilton did not write the history of philosophy, instead of choosing, as the direct object of his intellectual exertions, philosophy itself. He possessed a knowledge of the materials such as no one, probably for many generations, will take the trouble of acquiring again. Independently of the great interest and value attaching to a knowledge of the historical development of speculation, there is much in the old writers on philosophy, even those of the middle ages, really worth preserving for its scientific value. But this should be extracted, and rendered into the phraseology of modern thought, by persons as familiar with that as with the ancient, and possessing a command of its language; a combination never yet so perfectly realised as in Sir W. Hamilton. This, which no one but himself could have done, he has left undone, and has given us instead a contribution to mental philosophy, which has been more than equalled by many not superior to him in powers, and wholly destitute of erudition. Of all persons in modern times entitled to the name of philosophers, the two, probably, whose reading on the subject was the scantiest, in proportion to their intellectual capacity, were Archbishop Whately and Dr. Brown. Accordingly they are the only two of whom Sir W. Hamilton, though acknowledging their abilities, speaks with some tinge of superciliousness. It cannot be denied that both Dr. Brown and Whately would have thought and written better than they did, if they had been better read in the writings of previous thinkers; but I am not afraid that posterity will contradict me when I say, that either of them has done far greater service to the world in the origination and diffusion of important thought, than Sir W. Hamilton with all his learning; because, though indolent readers, they were both of them active and fertile thinkers.

"It is not that Sir W. Hamilton's erudition is not frequently of real use to him on particular questions of philosophy. It does him one valuable service: it enables him to know all the various opinions which can be held on the questions he discusses, and to conceive and express them clearly, leaving none of them out. This it does, though even this not always; but it does little else, even of what might be expected from erudition when enlightened by philosophy. He knew, with extraordinary accuracy, the ὅτι of each philosopher's opinions, but gave himself little trouble about the διότι. With one exception, I find no remark bearing upon that point in any part of his writings. I imagine he would have been much at a loss if he had been required to draw up a philosophical estimate of the mind of any great thinker. He never seems to look at any opinion of a philosopher in connection with the same philosopher's other opinions. Accordingly he is weak as to the mutual relations of philosophical doctrines. One of the most striking examples of this inability is in the case of Leibnitz," &c.

Here we find in a few sentences the conclusion which Mr. Mill conceives to be established by his book. We shall state how far we are able to concur with it. He has brought the matter to a direct issue, by weighing Sir W. Hamilton in the balance against two other actual cotemporaries; instead of comparing him with some unrealised ideal found only in the fancy of critics and reviewers.

Comparing Sir W. Hamilton with Dr. Brown, we cordially subscribe to the opinion of Mr. Mill. We think that Dr. Brown has "done far greater service to the world than Sir W. Hamilton, in the origination and diffusion of important thought." To speak only of two chief subjects in the field of important thought—Causality and the Freedom of the Will—we not only adopt the conclusions of Dr. Brown, but we admire both his acuteness and his originality in vindicating and illustrating the first of the two, while we dissent entirely from the views of Sir W. Hamilton. This alone would be sufficient to make us approve the superiority assigned by Mr. Mill to Dr. Brown. We discover no compensating item to be placed to the credit of Sir W. Hamilton: for the great doctrine of the Relativity of Knowledge, which is our chief point of philosophical brotherhood with him, was maintained by Brown also.

But in regard to Dr. Whately, our judgment is altogether different. We cannot consent to admit him as a superior, or even as an equal, to Sir W. Hamilton, "in the origination and diffusion of important thought." He did much service by reviving an inclination and respect for Logic, and by clearing up a part of the technical obscurity which surrounded it: but we look upon him as an acute and liberal-minded English theologian, enlarging usefully, though timidly, the intellectual prison in which many orthodox minds are confined—rather than as a fit aspirant to the cosmopolitan honours of philosophy. "An active and fertile thinker," Mr. Mill calls Whately; and such he undoubtedly was. But such also we consider Sir W. Hamilton to have been, in a degree at least equal. If the sentence which we have quoted above be intended to deny the predicate, "active and fertile thinker," of Sir W. Hamilton, we cannot acquiesce in it. His intellect appears to us thoroughly active and fertile, even when we dissent from his reasonings—nay, even in the midst of his inconsistencies, when a new growth of opinions is unexpectedly pushed up, on ground which we supposed to be already pre-occupied by another both older and different. And we find this same judgment implied in the discriminating remarks upon his philosophical procedure made by Mr. Mill himself—(pp. 271, 272.) For example, respecting Causality and the Freedom of the Will, we detect no want of activity and fertility, though marked evidence of other defects—especially the unconditional surrender of a powerful mind to certain privileged inspirations, worshipped as "necessities of thought."

While thus declaring how far we concur in the parallel here drawn of Sir W. Hamilton with Brown and Whately, we must at the same time add that the comparison is taken under

circumstances unduly favourable to these two last. There has been no exposure of *their* errors and inconsistencies, equal in penetration and completeness to the crushing volume which Mr. Mill has devoted to Sir W. Hamilton. To make the odds fair, he ought to furnish a similar systematic examination to Brown and Whately; enabling us to read their works (as we now do those of Sir W. Hamilton) with the advantage of his unrivalled microscope, which detects the minutest breach or incoherence in the tissue of reasoning—and of his large command of philosophical premisses, which brings into full notice what the author had overlooked. Thus alone could the competition between the three be rendered perfectly fair.

We regret, as Mr. Mill does, that Sir W. Hamilton did not undertake the composition of a history of philosophy. Nevertheless we must confess that we should hardly feel such regret, if we could see evidence to warrant Mr. Mill's judgment (p. 554) that Sir W. Hamilton was "indifferent to the διότι of a man's opinions, and that he was incompetent to draw up an estimate of the opinions of any great thinker," &c. Such incompetence, if proved to be frequent and considerable, would deprive an author of all chance of success in writing a history of philosophy. But the study of Sir W. Hamilton's works does not prove it to us, though Mr. Mill has convicted him of an erroneous estimate of Leibnitz. We say *frequent* and *considerable*, because no historian of philosophy is exempt from the defect more or less; or rather (to pass out of the self-confidence of the Absolute into the modesty of the Relative) we seldom find any historian whose estimate of great philosophical thinkers does not often differ from our own. Hence we are glad when ample original extracts are produced, enabling us to test the historian, and judge for ourselves—a practice which Sir W. Hamilton would have required no stimulus to enforce upon him. There ought, indeed to be various histories of philosophy, composed from different points of view; for the ablest historian cannot get clear of a certain exclusiveness belonging to himself. But, so far as we can conjecture what Sir W. Hamilton *would* or *could* have done, we think that a history of philosophy composed by him would have surpassed any work of the kind in our language.

We trust that Sir W. Hamilton's works will long continue to be read, along with Mr. Mill's examination of them; and we should be glad if the works of other philosophers could be read along with a comment of equal acuteness and impartiality. Any point of view which could command the adherence of such a mind as Sir W. Hamilton's deserves to be fully considered. Moreover, the living force of philosophy, as directress of human intelligence, depends upon keeping up in each of her devotees a full mastery of many divergent and opposite veins of reasoning—a knowledge, negative and affirmative, of the full case of opponents as well as of his own.

It is to Philosophy alone that *our* allegiance is sworn, and while we concur mostly with Mr. Mill's opinions, we number both him and Sir W. Hamilton as a noble pair of brethren, serving alike in her train.

Amicus Hamilton: magis amicus Mill; amica ante omnes Philosophia.

ART. II.—PRECURSORS OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION—SAINT-PIERRE AND D'ARGENSON.

1. *La Société Française et la Société Anglaise. Au* XVIII. *Siècle.* Par CORNELIS DE WITT. Paris. 1864.
2. *Introduction aux Mémoires et Journal du Marquis d'Argenson, publiés pour la Société de l'Histoire de France.* Par EDME JACQUES BENOIT RATHERY. Paris. 1859.
3. *Mémoires et Journal inédit du Marquis d'Argenson, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères de Louis XV., publiés et Annotés par le Marquis d'Argenson.* 1858.

BOLINGBROKE, writing in 1724 to the Abbé Alary, says, "Give my very humble compliments to our little academy, and say I should be extremely sorry not to see them in the course of next month. They have confirmed my taste for philosophy and reanimated my taste for letters. Many thanks to them." The allusion is to the once celebrated Club of the Entresol. Among the incidents of the first half of the eighteenth century, which may be regarded as precursors, or premonitions, of the French Revolution of '89, there is none more interesting and instructive than the formation of this small select political society which flourished in Paris from 1724 to 1731. The word club—destined to become afterwards of such terrible import in France—was, of course, an importation from England, and its title of Entresol was derived from its place of meeting—an agreeably situated Entresol occupied by the Abbé Alary in the house of the President Hainault, in the Place Vendôme. It consisted of twenty-three members, all of them advantageously known by their position and talents, some as magistrates, some as literary men, others who, before or subsequently, filled high public appointments. Among the latter were the Marquis de Saint-Coutest, who had acted as French plenipotentiary in negotiating the treaties of Baden and Cambray; his son, afterwards minister of foreign affairs; Marshal Count de Coignie; the Count de Camille, vice-admiral of France, a man of brilliant parts; and the Marquis d'Argenson—to whose memoirs, first published in 1825, we are indebted for precise information about the club—who was minister of foreign affairs in 1744. Such was its composition. Its president was the Abbé Alary, the correspondent and intimate friend of Bolingbroke, a man of extensive acquirements, who soon after its institution was appointed subpreceptor to the princes, but with a special proviso that he was to have one day in the week at his disposal for attending to his presidential duties. The government at this time was favourable to the project. The professed object

of its members was merely the assembling of a few friends to talk of the affairs of the day and modern political history; but it is evident from the formal organization they adopted, and the labours assigned to each member, that they hoped to form a political academy which would have a powerful influence on public opinion. The meetings took place every Saturday afternoon precisely at five, and continued till nine. The business was divided into three parts, each occupying a third of the time. The first was devoted to the reading of the French and foreign journals, that is, the "Dutch, and *even* English," the former being at that time the chronicles of Europe. Questions suggested by them were put and answered, and then followed a curious and interesting conversation on their contents, in which the diplomatists and such members as had been employed on foreign service usually took the lead. At this time, also, were read the president's replies to questions which it was the duty of one of the members to draw up, and submit to him respecting points in the public journals on which a special comment, or elucidation, was required. The advantage which Alary's position gave him of constant communication with the highest persons in the state, was, no doubt, turned to account in these answers. The second hour was devoted to such news as did not appear in print. The floating opinions of society on the events of the day; all the secret knowledge of the pulse and play of general feeling which the keen observation of experienced, penetrating minds could obtain; all those varied, scattered, unconnected remarks dropped here and there in their respective circles by watchful and thoughtful men, the obscure premonitors of change so important and so difficult to collect; whatever of such matter the diligence of the members could amass furnished the interesting matter of this division. And so attractive was it, their minds being already stimulated by their previous conference, that it was always difficult to bring this section to a close in order to proceed to the third. This consisted of reading either the works of the members—each member that chose it had some important department of inquiry assigned him, having reference to national law, administrative organization, and the different branches of political science of which he undertook to present the results from time to time,—or such other works as it was desirable to read in common, or political memoirs bearing upon their purpose; also of receiving intelligence of treaties recently concluded, of which every one was emulous to get the earliest information from the most official sources; and of reading the foreign correspondence diligently kept up by its members. The business over, the members dispersed to their several engagements, except that in the long days of summer it was not unusual to adjourn to the Tuileries, and continue their animated conferences in its most shady and sequestered avenues. "It was there," says D'Argenson, recalling these agreeable evenings—

> "—— que seuls en paix, errants dans le bois,
> Nous voyons à nos pieds les favoris des rois."

An exaggeration which, if it exceeds the point to which they attained, at least shows the point to which they aspired. And, in fact, their influence over opinion became so great as finally to give umbrage, and cause the dissolution of the club. The secret of their conferences it is believed was inviolably kept, but to conceal the effects which they had on the minds of those who contributed to them was of course impossible. When the members of the club, fresh from one of its exciting discussions, mingled with the world, they were unavoidably remarked not only for their early and exact intelligence, but for opinions necessarily tinged with the bold colouring of their inquiries. More, too, was frequently inferred from their expressions than they were meant to imply—any exaggerated inference of this kind seeming legitimate, where the speaker was known to belong to the Entresol. Persons about the government began to be disquieted, and complained angrily to Fleury, who for awhile parried the storm, but at length gave way, either because he began to alter his own opinion, or that he found it necessary to attend to certain remonstrances from a quarter which he did not deem it prudent to offend. "Tell your messieurs of the Entresol," said the cardinal one day to Alary, "that they are over-bold in their discourse, and that *foreigners even have complained to us.*" The interest in its proceedings on the part of foreigners is illustrated by a very remarkable circumstance. Some points of dispute had arisen between England and Spain, and the French government had shown a disposition to side with the latter power. To counteract this, and for the express purpose of enlightening public opinion through the influence of the club, no less a person than Horace Walpole, brother of the English premier, and who had been English ambassador in Paris, demanded permission to present himself at one of its meetings. The request was granted; Walpole was introduced, and made a speech of two hours on the subject alluded to, after which the club took up the discussion and came to a decision; but what that was, or whether any steps were taken in consequence, does not transpire. The fact, however, sufficiently explains why foreigners should be concerned in its proceedings, and the government feel bound to attend to their remonstrances. It is evident the club had stirred up some formidable opposition, which it might be no light matter to disregard. The cardinal's language was interpreted as an intimation that further persistence on their part would draw down a formal interdiction. The meetings were in consequence for awhile suspended. A proposal was then made to Fleury that the club, abstaining from all questions having reference to the politics of the day, should confine itself to abstract considerations relating to the general and permanent political and administrative interests of nations. But the cardinal observed, "that labours of this kind must necessarily lead much further than at first intended; that there were other subjects as well worthy of their attention as those they were inclined to prefer; and that if they continued their meetings, they must have the good-

ness to confine themselves to such." This answer was considered a complete interdiction. As a last resource, they resolved on meeting informally at each other's houses; but this, of course, got wind, and after their third meeting they received what they understood to be a warning that any more attempts to prolong the existence of the club would be dangerous.

We shall not be surprised at this disquiet when we come to know the opinions of two of the most remarkable and active of its members, whose names belong to history—Saint-Pierre and D'Argenson. Thrown for awhile into shade by the outbreak of the great Revolution of 1789, which for a long time annulled all interest in the earlier opinions of the century—of which it appeared to be so little a development as to draw even from Burke the strange remark, that it was an "accident which, had it been foreseen, could never have happened"—it is only of late years they have been again coming to the front, bearing with them speculations and opinions explicative of the apparently abnormal phenomenon which subsequently ensued. To the latter of these earnest and thoughtful men, a French historian, M. Henri Martin, whose copious and critical 'History of France' finds great favour with what M. de Witt calls the Radical party—that is, we presume, the Republican party, not including the red—pays a distinguished tribute; according him much ability as a statesman, and noticing with emphasis the bold spirit of political innovation which his writings display, and which, he says, reminds him of Rousseau. Of the mental and moral qualities of the former, a remarkable record is left us in the writings of one whose name is still a power. Rousseau, in his 'Confessions,' informs us that when making his *entrée* into Parisian society, he received an invitation to dinner from Madame Dupin—the wife of a rich Receiver-General, and one of three sisters who were called "The Graces"—whose house and hospitable board were the rendezvous of all that was most distinguished by rank, fashion, or talent in the metropolis. The guests assembled to meet the young candidate for fame were Buffon, Voltaire, and the Abbé Saint-Pierre. The impression which the latter produced upon him was profound and never obliterated; he applied to him then the somewhat singular expression of "la Raison ambulante," and at a later period described him as "a man of rare superiority, the honour of his age and his species; the only one who had ever made reason his sole pursuit." In our own days a distinguished historian, M. Louis Blanc, in his brilliant summary of the 'Sources and Causes of the French Revolution' (which forms the first volume of his history of that event), places him among the precursors of the Revolution, speaks of him as a publicist full of matter, lauds the intrepidity with which he uttered political criticisms that gave offence to many, and suggests that if on many points he did not provoke hostility, it was because he was so much before his time that his views were too little appreciated to be feared. Indeed, both these men were regarded as dreamers—D'Argenson, in fact, ridiculed by the courtiers, was sometimes called "D'Argenson la bête;"—and if to be allied by our speculations to the future rather than to the present be to dream, such undoubtedly they were. Hence it was, as D'Argenson informs us, that Saint-Pierre's feelings towards the club were those of a man towards a country he has long and hopelessly desired to see, and where he finds himself at last. It was here he found hearers willing to listen to him, and to discuss the value "of those researches and discoveries which directed his attention successively to every department of the State;" a home in which he could find refuge for his favourite views, and where he might hope they would be cherished when he should be no more. And though there is plain indication that his sanguine temperament carried him to conclusions to which his fellow-members could not at all times respond, it is equally clear that the difference was one of degree alone, and that it was not by the nature or direction of his theories, but their occasional extent, that he was sometimes at issue with his able and admiring associates. Some knowledge of the writings and opinions of a man in such relations to the most intelligent, thoughtful, and inquiring persons of his day, could not fail to be of interest, were it only that they were among the first faint whispers of that inexorable demand for change that burst forth with such coarse and horrible clamour towards the century's close. But they are otherwise interesting as touching on subjects of vital importance to ourselves, and as exhorting us either to a fulness of practice to which we have not attained, or to indispensable aims to which we have not yet seriously directed our minds.

Born in 1658, of a noble and distinguished family in Normandy, Charles Irénée Castel de Saint-Pierre was educated at the university of Caen, and being a younger brother, was destined by his parents to the Church. His own inclination would have led him to accept the tonsure and fix himself in a cloister. Such a choice, looking to the constitution of his mind in after life, we should have found it hard to account for, had he not himself furnished the explanation. From this it appears—and a curious fact it is—that a fancy for monastic seclusion was in his boyhood a prevailing malady among young men, and he often cites with approbation a writer of the time, who, in allusion to this morbid fancy, to which, he says, every young man was subject once, though perhaps only once in his life, stigmatizes it as "la petite vérole de l'esprit." Fortunately for him, so he afterwards thought, a feeble state of health was considered a disqualification for this worthless career, and he thus escaped being a victim to this singular epidemic—this malignant "*small-pox of the mind.*"

Soon after leaving college, he and his friend Varignon—subsequently one of the most distinguished mathematicians of France—went to Paris to improve, or rather to seek their fortunes. Here they took an apartment in the Rue St. Jacques, and lived together in common upon the abbé's funds. But this did not quite suit the latter. His income did not exceed 1800 francs a year; Varignon had nothing.

We can easily conceive why any one should object to so one-sided an arrangement, but we might guess for some time without discovering why Saint-Pierre did so. The fact, is that what dissatisfied him was not his friend sharing his purse, but that he should do so as a dependant. But how to make him otherwise? A very simple expedient did it. Out of his 1800 francs a year he insisted on settling 300 on his friend. "I give them to you," said he, "not as a loan, but as a gift, that you may be perfectly independent of me, and leave me whenever you are tired of me." A characteristic trait foreshadowing the whole history of his life, and practically illustrating that theory of reciprocal benevolence and goodwill which was the moving principle of all his schemes. After reading this anecdote, indeed, we are prepared for the unflagging zeal with which he in after life laboured to realize his theory of beneficence. Succeed, he of course did not. But he has left a remarkable record of his efforts in the word bienfaisance—beneficence, active kindness, as distinguished from benevolence, intentional kindness—which he made so general and popular as to fix it permanently in his native tongue, where we find it so often distinguishing charitable associations. The word is to be found in Balzac, but, as D'Alembert informs us, was completely buried and forgotten until revived by Saint-Pierre. We may safely regard such a result as a proof that his writings were largely circulated, and had considerable weight. It may be fairly a question, too, whether the remarkable elevation of the word "fraternity" at a later period may not be owing to those incessant exhortations to reciprocal acts of kindness, as indispensable instruments of civilization, to be found in them. Soon after this little arrangement was made, the two friends were joined by two other kindred spirits, the one destined to shine as a philosophical historian, the other, if we accept the opinion of Voltaire, as the most universal genius of his time—Vertot and Fontenelle. A companionship to which, after long years, the latter could recur with feelings of tender regret, as he looked back to that period, the happiest of their lives, while they yet enjoyed a pleasure, on which he says at that time they set but too little value—that of being unknown.

One of the first literary occupations of Saint-Pierre, a treatise upon Grammar, though it eventally brought him a distinction, in itself no mean literary glory in those days—admission into the Academy—was probably the one of all his pursuits he looked back upon with the least delight. He seems henceforth assiduously to have devoted himself to the study of political science, and to an attentive consideration of the means by which the condition of society might be improved, which he afterwards brought to bear with varied but considerable success.

It was while thus occupied for several years in his peaceful retreat in the Rue St. Jacques, that an event occurred which transferred him to a very different scene. He purchased the place of almoner to the Duchess of Orleans, through whose influence he was soon afterwards made Abbé of Tiron. Residing, in virtue of his office, principally at Versailles, his friends beheld with mistrust his translation to a sphere so little in harmony with the tranquillity of his nature and his simple and moderate desires. They were unnecessarily alarmed. Instead of being frightened back to his retreat by the glare and whirl of its giddy crowds, he seems to have experienced an agreeable excitement from their careless joy, like that the traveller feels, who, in a strange land, mingles at some season of festivity with its holiday and laughing throngs. "I was comfortable enough," he writes to Madame de Lambert, "in my cabin in the Quartier St. Jacques, but as yet I am more so here." It was a curious instance of one whose mental constitution was in almost all respects the opposite of a courtier's making himself at home, and finding his existence not only tolerable but desirable in a court. To the serene disposition of Saint-Pierre there must however, have been an exquisite charm in that graceful amenity of manner, in that elegant mechanism of deportment which imparts such a smooth and harmonious movement to the personal intercourse of the refined, which will in every country be found united with those classes on which the action of intelligence has been longest felt,—a tolerably clear indication of its having an intrinsic merit, and conducing to some useful end. But there was also a peculiar advantage to him, as he imagined, and no doubt found, in this abode. It brought him into contact with the crowds of courtiers who, he says, have more influence on affairs than is generally supposed; with eminent persons charged with the highest offices of state, and procured him the acquaintance of many who, belonging to classes not suffering from the heavier evils of society, and not wanting practical relief, had patience and inclination as a mere mental pastime, to listen to speculative projects of reform. Immense advantages these in a country where, according to a distinguished writer, M. Taine, conversation has been the principal instrument of civilization, and at a time when, in that country, it was certainly the chief vehicle for the circulation of ideas. But if he made use of his opportunities, he did not abuse them. He was abstemious in conversation, not from temperament only, but on principle; feeling with singular modesty that what he wrote no one was compelled to read, but that when he spoke others were constrained to hear,—a necessity he was unwilling to impose. A judicious distinction, which one cannot help wishing were more common in the world—a rule of mercy, of self-denial, we could willingly prescribe to those oral essayists who are for ever inflicting on us in conversation what we should carefully elude if it were in print. With Saint-Pierre it was less a merit than a fault. Silently and timidly reserved unless specially brought out, he then confined himself to points which best he understood, but these points were neither trivial nor few; for besides his political knowledge, which was extensive, his memory was stored with a vast variety of anecdotes, which he told with great simplicity, but with considerable point. To

one thing he was scrupulously attached, and that was to be exact. "No one," he said, "is under obligation to amuse, but every one is under an obligation not to deceive." But of his own merits as a talker he could never be convinced; and when, on some occasion, a clever and accomplished woman, after a long conversation with him on his most serious plans, warmly thanked him for the information and pleasure she had derived, "Madam," he replied, with a modesty which was as sincere in fact as gallant in form, "I am but a sorry instrument which you have touched with skill." Had his conversation, indeed, resembled his writings—of which twelve volumes exist—it would doubtless have been deficient in grace of expression, though marked by occasional flashes of eloquent warmth, and not without a certain air of dignity arising from the deep conviction of the speaker, the spotless purity of his purpose, and the lofty aim of his speculations. From the few specimens we have of it, it is evident it was distinguished by that uncompromising spirit of truth that was conspicuous in his works, and that must have often startled the servile associations of his listeners by the uncourtier-like boldness of its views. When some one in the ordinary and obsequious language of the times insisted that kings were gods of the earth, "I know not," he said, "if Caligula and Domitian be gods; what I am very sure of is they were not men." And hearing it asserted on another occasion that even tyrants had performed acts of clemency for which they deserved praise they had not received, "Never fear," said he, "but that all the good they did was made the most of during their life-time; the only pity is that their subjects seem to be so little aware of it." The virtuous acts of princes, he maintained, would always be written in the hearts of the people; and was wont to say that with whatever pleasure he might hear the praises of good princes, whether in books, which were always a little suspicious to him, or in courts, which were very much more so, he should never be perfectly content until he had gone into the villages and found it there—language as familiar and commonplace now as it was new and startling then. Nor can we possibly estimate its force unless we restore it to the context of the times and country in which it was used, contrast it with the servile notions of kingcraft that were then afloat, and remember how little the false and bloated glory that still commanded the adoration of the day could have stood the application of this simple and conclusive test. For though there were some like the minister Maurepas, who, according to D'Argenson, "despised not only God but the very notion of divinity; not only the king but royalty," there was a vast amount of that respect for royalty in the abstract so curiously illustrated by the high-principled and self-respecting Duke de Luynes, who, though shocked at the vileness of the creature that filled the throne, could, in his reverence for the throne itself, regret that the ceremony had been dropped of bowing to the king's bed in passing through his bedchamber, and to his dinner-napkin on entering his dining-room.

It was probably at the Régent's desire, as well as in consequence of his acquirements, that he received the appointment of private secretary to the Cardinal, then Abbé de Polignac, when he went, in 1712, as plenipotentiary of France, to negotiate the Peace of Utrecht. In the course of these negotiations it was that Saint-Pierre conceived his project of universal peace, which he developed in a work of considerable historical research, that not only attracted attention in France, but was translated into several of the principal languages of Europe. To this work, by which *unfortunately* for Saint-Pierre's reputation he is the most remembered, we shall presently take occasion to refer.

He was now on his return incessantly engaged upon various publications connected with political science. Well acquainted with his subject and indefatigable in its development, it is perfectly surprising to what a variety of points he addressed himself—government, the church, police, military organization, commerce, conventual life, codification of the laws, religious tolerance, taxation, national education, including subordinate and dependent points, in turn exercised his pen, and not unfrequently, with the happiest results. It would be difficult, in fact, to point out an individual in any country, who, holding no official situation, belonging to no party, sustained by no influence, backed by no public excitement, having no other aim than the public good, ever devoted himself so zealously to the suggestion and exposition of practical reforms in the administrative organization of his country as Saint-Pierre. Nor were his efforts entirely devoid of success. If his bold project of dividing and weakening the direct action of the Crown by investing the management of each department of the State in a council chosen and perpetuated by ballot, under pretence of supplying the king with exacter information, and less inconstant views than could be possibly derived from intriguing and ever-changing ministers, neither did nor was likely to succeed; if his startling scheme of making bishops removable at the end of every ten years, unless continued in their sees by the approbation of a peculiarly constituted board, deciding by ballot; if his proposals of *suffering the clergy to marry, of making all titles of honour personal and not hereditary*, had as little chance of succeeding, they are in the highest degree interesting, as indicating tendencies of political and ecclesiastical reforms which, though totally unknown to the nation at large, had already an existence in a few, but very distinguished and practical minds. More fortunate on more accessible points, he had the satisfaction to see his suggestions for the improved administration of police, for the better regulation of religious houses, for stopping the increase of mendicancy, but above all for the substitution of a graduated tax in lieu of the fearfully oppressive system of capricious taxation which ground the peasant to dust—one of the most frightful sores of the ante-revolution-

ary times—more or less adopted. Voltaire, who had his own reasons for being peevish with Saint-Pierre, acknowledged the statesmanlike ability which he displayed in the last of these reforms.

But there were other great subjects on which he also dwelt with the deepest earnestness, and in the treatment of which he displayed a noble liberality and breadth of views. One of these was religious toleration. In him we do not find that dualism of feeling and policy which so frequently offends us in many men, who, expansive and progressive in all other directions, irresistibly contract into bigots, and lose the faculty of advance, wherever religion is concerned. Indeed his notions of religious tolerance were extraordinary for that day, and are not without their instruction for this. He was willing to give men every liberty except that of quarrelling about their creeds. Theological controversy he could not in any respect abide, and his recipe for curing it was at all events summary—imposing silence on both parties, and leaving each to its belief. A kindred sentiment in D'Argenson has drawn down the censure of M. de Witt, who thinks it found favour with him because, to prevent the religious from controverting would, by stifling the vitality of religion, extinguish faith, and relax the check which is placed on the corruption of manners. This censure, utterly inapplicable to Saint-Pierre, is unfair to D'Argenson. It is a sufficient explanation of this sentiment that both these men had fresh in their memory one of the most crapulous theological controversies that ever raged, profoundly disturbing their country, and accompanied by acts and exhibitions in which religion played the part of a street mountebank, and was occasionally made to grin through a horse-collar. A regard for the honour of religion, as well as a desire to annihilate one of the most pestilent causes of angry irritation, might well suggest a policy of restraint to men who had such profound reasons for being sensible of its mischief. To fetter expression it is true cannot be wise; but certainly mankind will never receive any benefit from the quarrel between the Jesuits and Jansenists, and equally certain that religion was entirely discredited by it. It is true that D'Argenson had a good deal in common in one respect with the moral laxity of his times; but so little was there in him approaching to debauch that, as M. de Witt himself informs us, he was regarded by the greater part of his contemporaries as a person of almost irreproachable morality. An error in doctrine Saint-Pierre thought less dangerous than a breach of Christian charity in correcting it. He was not one of those timid believers who are only confident in their faith in proportion as it is submissively received, and to whom every aberration in the faith of other men seems a protanto invalidation of their own. "Truth," he was wont to say, "may be submerged, but cannot be destroyed—sink it as you will, it must come to the surface—but strife and uncharitable discord might adjourn its reappearance for an indefinite time." An anecdote, which he has himself preserved to us in his 'Annales Politiques,' will best illustrate the extent and elevation of his views in this way. A Molinist having written some furious letters against the Jansenists, forged the Abbé's name to them—a proof of the general respect entertained for his opinions; soon afterwards a bigot of his acquaintance, one of those very excellent persons who believe all violence lawful in the cause of truth, compliments him on the eloquence and justice of his supposed views. The Abbé, who would as soon have been suspected of writing a panegyric on hatred, or of preaching a crusade, as of engaging in a religious controversy, was not slow in denying it. "But are you not a Molinist?" said the inquirer. "I agree with Molina, but I am not a Molinist; I do not mix myself up with a party." "You, then, sometimes leave the truth to take care of itself?" was the rejoinder. "Yes, willingly, and always," said Saint-Pierre, to the dismay of the bigot, "when by doing so I can preserve justice and charity." According to his view right conduct, or really religious practice, was of more importance to religion than right belief. Many a terrific page of history had instructed him how the latter might exist without the former; and not only without it, but to its prejudice. Hence it was that observing the means pursued to keep men orthodox to be precisely such as had made them bad, he so manfully affirmed that whenever from any momentary collision between the two branches of religion, the speculative and the practical, he was obliged to choose, he would give a preference to that which makes injustice impossible over that which had hitherto made it indispensable; knowing by the plainest evidence of history that the latter might triumph to the exclusion of the former, but knowing from the plainest evidence of reason, that the triumph of the former must sooner or later bring on the triumph of the latter, as far as it is identical with truth. It was in consequence of this deep-rooted aversion to theological strife that he looked with no favour upon Protestantism. He, in fact, regarded it as a revival of dogmatic war, and as the means of prolonging those feuds which, in his opinion, had hitherto neutralized religion; but he was of course for granting it the most absolute toleration. Time and reason working their way quietly, would, he thought, in every case of human error be always sufficient for reform, and he was sanguine enough to hope that even Islamism itself would fall before them, that its muphtis and cadis would find it to their interest to undeceive the multitude and substitute a simple faith for the fables of the Koran. He indeed wrote a treatise on this very subject, which Voltaire esteemed the most curious of his works; being doubtless much interested in it, because he saw the possibility of applying to Christianity the arguments which are there employed to demonstrate the decline and fall of Islamism, but it is by no means clear that such an application of them was in the Abbé's thoughts. There is no reason to believe that he disbelieved the dogmatic portion of the religion in which he was educated, though he wished to narrow its sphere, to shut it up entirely within the indi-

vidual as a thing purely personal, and exclusively affecting himself. And it is interesting to observe with regard to this particular view of Saint-Pierre's, namely, the detaching the morality of the Christian scheme, and employing it apart from its mysterious dogmas, that, as was the case indeed with so many of his views, it presents itself to us in a practical and working shape in the course of the great political convulsion which ensued. In that remarkable little sect, which appeared in 1797, under the strange title of 'Theophilanthropists, or Adorers of God, and Friends of Mankind,' including some of the most able and respectable men of the time, anxious to revive that religious feeling which had been completely destroyed by the Revolution, and which they declared indispensable to society, we find a perfect echo of the Abbé's views of religion, as he contemplated it only in its character of a practical moral instrument of social regulation and restraint. As the early fathers of the Church stood before the Gospel—so did Saint-Pierre. What they chiefly gazed upon with admiration was its moral teaching; it was on this, as Paley justly remarks, that they delighted to dwell, not on its dogmas;—so did Saint-Pierre. Like them, he read Christianity by the purer light of its early dawn, not as we do, through the hot and reeking medium of dogmatic strife. He clings manfully to the ignored and specifically Christian commandment, which was to swallow up the rest, and loves his God with all his heart, and his neighbour as himself. Such was the large and comprehensive view which the Abbé took of religious toleration, too large and comprehensive to suit the taste of everybody, even in this age of greater liberality. Marvellous was it for a time when bigotry had not yet lost its tusks, and in a country where, even as late as 1750, a bishop could dare to call upon the minister to extirpate from the kingdom a sect so deadly to its glory as the Protestants. Marvellous, too, is it and disgraceful, that a Catholic priest, writing in the earliest dawn of the eighteenth century, should manifest a greater courage of tolerance, a more valiant confidence in the dogmas of his faith left to take of themselves, than is shown in the latter half of the nineteenth century by a large proportion of a Protestant clergy and ministry permitted to be the religious instructors of an enlightened Protestant people.

Thus irreconcilably opposed to bigotry and intolerance, his great aim was to destroy them, and knowing that for this purpose knowledge and intelligence, universally diffused, were the most effective weapons, his thoughts naturally turned to another great subject—national education.

It was the Abbé's destiny to live at a period when there was very much of that stately and decorative knowledge which flashed a concentrated light upon the few, illumining the general darkness with a single spot of dazzling brilliance, walled round, as it were, with a barrier of impenetrable gloom. He had seen all Europe turning with eagerness to behold it, and had heard the buzz of admiration which spread through nations as they gazed curious and wondering at the sight. Very different was the impression produced on him. To confine light to the hill-tops he thought might suit the exigencies of despotism, but would not suit exigencies of a higher kind; what he required was a light that should descend into the valleys, replacing the general obscurity with a mild and useful lustre, by which no eye should be dazzled, and by which every eye should see.

It is indeed his distinguished merit to have been, if not the first, at all events one of the first, who contemplated education in its great and proper character, as the common right and property of the mass, not as the privilege of the few. To stop short of this result was, in his opinion, to defraud society of its due, and obstruct knowledge in its most important direction. But eminent minds nevertheless had stopped short of this consequence, had not caught even a glimpse of it. "Even Milton and Locke," it has been very justly observed, "though both men of a great benevolence towards the larger family of man, and both men whose sentiments were democratic, yet seem in their writings on education to have had in view no education but that of a *gentleman*. It had not presented itself even to their minds that education was a blessing of which the indigent orders could be expected to partake." What Milton and Locke had not even surmised was developed by Saint-Pierre to its fullest extent. He not only insisted on the necessity of popular instruction, but insisted on it as a necessity of the gravest and most urgent nature. He called upon his country to do what to its honour it has since done, and what our own, in the face of many difficulties, has at last succeeded in doing, namely, to enrol education among its primary concerns. Among other things he contemplated a system of gratuitous education for the poor. In order to effect this, it was necessary to secure a number of competent teachers; and for this purpose he proposed making use of the regular clergy. Like the Chancellor d'Hôpital, he had no great esteem for them, but, like him, too, he saw the possibility of utilising them by abridging their numbers, and employing the remainder partly in works of charity—as in the administration of hospitals, and the general care of the infirm—and partly in works of education. He proposed charging them with the management of the national schools; preferring them to the secular clergy as less expensive and having no other fixed duties, interests, or cares to distract them. But he knew too well the treasure he was committing to their hands to leave it to their own control. They were to be the teachers; but the nation, in the person of its magistrates, was to superintend and direct the teaching; and not only the temporal teaching, but—mark the bold, sagacious spirit of this believing man—the spiritual as well; to see the latter was directed, not to dogmatic and controversial, but to practical and moral ends. Dogmatic teaching he left to the clergy outside; wiser in his generation than we in ours, who, a few years since, when the Dean of Chiches-

ter—then Vicar of Leeds—proposed a similar arrangement, vigorously hooted it down as a "Godless scheme."

Another of his suggestions was that certain convents in Paris should be turned into what are now called normal schools for forming female teachers to superintend the education of the poor of their own sex. But of his projects connected with this subject, the boldest and not the least useful—but which we can well imagine must have excited the supreme contempt of those whom it concerned—was the partial conversion of the French Academy into "*A Society for the diffusion of useful Knowledge*," such as we have seen established by eminent men in our own day. Undaunted either by the indignation or contempt he might excite, our practical and clear-headed Abbé proposed that, setting aside at least a portion of their glittering toils, its members should occupy themselves with plain and popular treatises for the peasantry, unfolding the best principles of husbandry, indicating safe and simple medicaments for the ordinary maladies incident to men and domestic animals, and familiarly explaining all those phenomena which among ignorant people are the source of superstitious alarm. Works of this kind addressed in the first instance to the inferior clergy, almost as ignorant as their flocks, but yet a little more capable of profiting by them, would, he justly thought, be the means of insinuating a vast amount of the most beneficial kind of knowledge into the minds of the neglected and miserably uninstructed people.* The study of practical science he insisted upon as an indispensable feature in any system of national education, even though it should be necessary in consequence to contract the range of classical acquirements.

One capital suggestion, on which he over and over again insisted, we must not omit, and that is of rendering every school a seminary of strictly moral instruction, and making the practical acquirement of the moral virtues as essential a branch of education as any of the others, or even the most essential of all. He did not choose that the bearing of men to each other, under the guidance of charity and love, should be left to be an incidental consequence of the elementary instruction, whether moral or religious, that they received—he wished it to form a substantial and practical part of their teaching. He proposed, what never has been acted upon, but which it should be the first great business of a nation to endeavour to accomplish, that acts of conduct should come within the jurisdiction of primary education as indispensably as rules of conduct, and that the child should be trained to do what he is taught to believe is right. Unhappily, however indispensable such an aim may be, the difficulty of carrying it into execution appears at present insurmountable. It is indeed attempted in the education of what are called juvenile offenders—in reality juvenile victims, for well indeed may we apply to them what Quintilian says of the children of the rich brought early into contact with vicious practices, "*Discunt hæc miseri antequam sciant vitia esse*"—who cannot have the benefit of the home where the only moral training we get, such as it is, takes place. How far it can be successfully introduced into every school is a problem waiting for solution, which can be solved only when society is willing to give the teacher a social status and such liberal emolument as will induce able and gifted men to devote themselves to a service which yields to none in importance to the state.

Such being the bold originality of his views on the two great questions we have been considering, so much in contrast with the general feelings of the day, but representative of currents of opinion destined in a marvellously brief space of time to coalesce, and become a vast and widely inundating stream, we are naturally curious to know in what relation he stood to his contemporaries with respect to ideas of government. His work, with its singular title of 'Polysynodie,' will give us the clue, and the more so as it exposed him to the wrath of a very distinguished body of men, full of devotion in one direction to the past. The subject was this: When that man of superior talents, utterly emasculated by an ultra-debauched life, Philip Duke of Orleans, assumed the reigns of government as Regent of France, he instituted for the better management of public business several departments of state, or councils, under the general direction of the council of regency. Into these were huddled together, as St. Simon tells us, three classes of men—great nobles, novices in affairs, veterans in intrigue, overflowing with pride, and not incapable of doing petty things; —personal friends of the Regent, the very cream of the profligate, calculated to embarrass much more than assist a government;—and finally masters of requests, councillors of state, and other functionaries, the real workers, and who without any thanks or distinction were busily employed in repairing the blunders of their incompetent colleagues. These councils soon became nests of intrigue and were set aside. It was ostensibly to reform their constitution by suggesting a mode of selection through means of ballot, by which they might be composed of qualified men, with sufficient independence of action to enable them to work without apprehension in their different departments for the public good, that the Abbé took up his pen. But the real drift of the work was to a much higher end. In order to justify the principle of councils it was necessary to show the mischief that ensued in a government in which the supreme authority was more or less delegated to a single minister, and the advantage that would follow from interposing between

* This valuable suggestion, like so many others of Saint-Pierre's, reappears at this day. In his admirable address to the Social Science Congress in October last, Dr. Lankester says—"It is only when *those who instruct weekly in their pulpits*, and influence the education of our lower class schools, are *themselves* taught the great laws by which the Creator governs the life of the world, that we can expect our working classes to exercise that judgment and self-control with regard to their health, the want of which causes the sacrifice of holocausts of victims amongst them every year."

the King and the people some institution more permanent in its views, more regular in its action, more reflective of the interests of the people, and less dependent on the favour and caprice of the sovereign, than a single and supreme minister. It was Rousseau's opinion that this work was the best in point of manner as well as matter of all he wrote, and it was with this he began the task he had undertaken at the request of Madame Dupin and the Abbé Mably, of converting Saint-Pierre's dry and ungracious style into captivating French; for, strangely enough, though he had won his way into the Academy by a treatise on grammar, and was punctilious enough, like our Phonographists, to insist on spelling words according to their sound, he was wilfully negligent of the graces of style. A great mistake anywhere, but especially in a country where brilliancy of expression is more than the rival of solidity of thought. But whatever might be the merits of the work it had the effect of bringing a storm about the author's ears, and of exposing him to the only persecution to which by good fortune, as it seemed, he ever was exposed. It astonished everybody, irritated many, and made the members of the Academy wild with rage. With an intense admiration for their late royal patron, Louis XIV., at least equal to their admiration for themselves, they regarded any reflection on his memory as an insult to the Academy. But that it should have been committed by one of their own body was a monstrous and inexpiable offence. To cast him forth was the only punishment they could inflict, but this was, in their opinion, little less terrible than the extrusion of Adam after the fall—so they cast him forth. In vain did Saint-Pierre request a hearing; the Cardinal de Polignac, though he had personal grounds of complaint against the late King, was the first to oppose it. In what D'Alembert describes as an eloquent "Catalinaire," he reminded the august forty that this was but a repetition of a first offence (in his proposals for a graduated tax Saint-Pierre had previously been a little free of his censures), which had been aggravated by a third; for the honest Abbé had written an explanatory letter to the Regent in which, with characteristic simplicity, he declared that he knew of no other way in which he could have mentioned the late King, if he mentioned him at all; and such was the success of the cardinal's eloquence, that when the Abbé's request was put to the vote, there were but four voices in its favour. If his chances of a hearing were so few, his chances of escaping exclusion would of course be still fewer; and accordingly when the motion was made for it, a single white ball was the sum of the opposition, and to that Fontenelle was obliged to confess in order to save his friend Sacy from the imputation. The Regent, of whom Saint-Pierre was a favourite, though dissatisfied with these proceedings, contented himself with desiring that no successor should be appointed. He was in fact excluded, not expelled; and his place remained vacant as long as he lived. The vengeance thus taken was not thought, it seems, fully to expiate the offence; for though Saint-Pierre, with his invincible sweetness of disposition, continued to live in unbroken amity with his colleagues, persisting to the last in making presentations of his works to the Academy, and taking a sincere interest in its concerns, he was at his death denied the customary eulogy on a deceased member—an act of folly which Voltaire sharply rebuked. "The idle flowers," he says, "which are thrown on the tomb of an academician add nothing to his reputation or his merit; but the refusal was an outrage, and the services which Saint-Pierre had rendered, his probity and his amiability, merited a very different treatment." It was not until 1775, several years after his death, that the Academy was sufficiently alive to its own dignity to repair this foolish wrong, which it did through the mouth of D'Alembert, who paid him the tribute which his talents and virtues demanded, and which has preserved to us the most of the personal knowledge respecting him we possess. But the highest eulogy on Saint-Pierre is the exclusion itself. Our first impulse is to ascribe it to a most base and pitiful spirit of servile adulation. There is no reason to suppose that this was in any degree the case. It seems to have been an honest and spontaneous movement of resentment. Louis was dead, his successor a child, and the Regent in no way tender about the late King's reputation. While the striking fact of the Academy pronouncing, we might say, with an almost unanimous voice—if the single exception were not that of Fontenelle, —under cover of the ballot-box, his sentence of exclusion shows it to have been actuated by a *bonâ-fide* feeling of indignation shared by the most honourable men, and arising out of a delirious admiration of the glories of the last reign. Nor are we to suppose that this feeling was confined to the Academy alone; for a contemporary journal assures that there were many inclined to regard the heretical language of Saint-Pierre in the heinous light of a state crime. We must therefore acquit the academicians of anything more than a silly expression of a universal feeling of the day, but in doing this we pay a high tribute to the superior intelligence of the man who could so freely raise himself above it—a tribute, too, to something more than his intelligence, to the generous boldness with which, in his ardent desire to benefit his country, he fearlessly affronted it. It is indeed a curious fact that one of the reasons which Rousseau gives for not completing his task of editing the Abbé's papers, to which we have referred, was the freedom of his strictures on previous reigns. "His works," said Rousseau, "were either criticisms, or contained criticisms, on preceding governments, and *some of them so free that it is a wonder he escaped.* But the fact was, he was considered in the public departments as a species of public preacher rather than as a working politician, and so he was not regarded. Had I, a foreigner moreover," he adds, "contrived to get him listened to, it might have had a very different result." Rousseau was mistaken. It was not because the writer was not eloquent, but because power was not sensitive, and opinion not on the alert. And the proof is, that when Rousseau a few

years afterwards, in his 'Contrat Social,' by the boldness of his views, and the brilliancy of his declamation, made himself so obnoxious to the government as to compel him to fly from its pursuit, he was eventually allowed to return and die unquestioned, though his works were still eagerly read; the government, for a moment excited, relapsing into its usual indifference to speculative views.

It was lucky, however, for Saint-Pierre that, at the earnest request of his family, he consented to adjourn the publication of his 'Annales Politiques' until after his death. For it is there that he treats the public character of Louis XIV. with unsparing severity, and shows how the natural qualities of the man were corrupted by the mischievous training that prepared him to be a despotic King. He acknowledges that for "a most puissant and most ill-educated King," he was really estimable in a variety of ways. It is easy to perceive that his attacks are not against the casual tenant of the throne, but against the motives that determine the occupants of thrones in general. He selected Louis as the most brilliant, not as the greatest criminal, of his class. He even throws the burden of his faults on the political ignorance of his age. "We are still," he says, "in the infancy of reason, and it is this immaturity of reason in our times which excuses the great and numerous faults of Louis XIV. He lived in the midst of other children as ill-instructed as himself." Voltaire was as much exasperated with his latter criticism, as the Academy had been with the former; and, forgetting in his anger the tribute he had paid to the writer's worth, snappishly called him an old child and a libeller. But Saint-Pierre could well have afforded to smile at this; he knew full well how much his estimate of kingship differed from that of Voltaire, and was quite confident that his estimate was a sound one. To eschew the pursuit of glory, to desire to divest themselves of arbitrary power, to direct all their efforts to ameliorating the condition of every class of their subjects, these he considered as essential to the honourable reputation of kings; and these he did not find among the qualities of that monarch who furnished Voltaire with the subject of a biography, which is an historical romance.

The character of Hamlet would be omitted from the play, were we to pass over in silence that famous subject by which, to his disadvantage, he is most remembered—his advocacy of international peace. The subject is far too important to be put aside with indifference.

"There are two ways," says Cicero, "of settling disputed questions—by discussion or by force—the former is in accordance with the character of man, the latter of brutes." It is said of this eminent person, that his writings powerfully contributed, in the three first centuries, to the diffusion of Christianity; and if so, it is a matter of regret that his disparaging estimate of war was not one of the views impressed on the minds of those he brought over to the new faith. In modern times, a writer of great renown in his day, and who continues to be one of our chief authorities on international law, Grotius, has in a work devoted to that subject, declared that, for various important reasons he assigns, "it will be useful, and even necessary, that Congresses of Christian powers should be held, in which controversies might be settled, and parties be compelled to accept peace upon equal terms." And we suppose we may say that it is to the honour of his learned translator, Dr. Whewell, that he should have become his interpreter, partly from its being his opinion that "the progress of the study of international law on such principles as those of Grotius, and the increase of a regard for the authority of such law, are among the most hopeful avenues to that *noble idea of the love of mankind—perpetual peace;* because along this avenue we can see a long historical progress, as well as a great moral idea." These, after all, are very respectable authorities for a foolish idea. M. Louis Blanc, also, has called our attention to the fact, that our own time has witnessed a confederacy of kings for the pacification of Europe, and thinks we are moving on a current which is leading us to a more holy and effective alliance, that of the peoples. Rousseau, he tells us, thought the *project* was too bold for the times, but passed a judgment upon the book which he thinks will commend itself to a future not far distant. "It is," says Rousseau, "a solid and sensible book; it is of importance it should exist." To a person unacquainted with the history of Christianity it would appear incredible, that a man otherwise esteemed for his abilities should suffer in his reputation for wisdom, for having suggested a project of perpetual international peace. If there be one thing more than another we vaunt of in our national religion, especially on days of ceremony, it is that it is essentially a religion of peace and charity and brotherly love. But this is with the tacit understanding that we are not to be hampered with its restrictions in practice; we are quite willing they should be matters of faith, and subjects of congratulation; we are liberally lax in imposing them as necessities of conduct. The official expounders of the religion are always extremely complaisant in this respect; politely accommodating themselves to their own convenience, and that of the laity. In the middle ages a bishop armed to the teeth sallied forth to fight, but delicately mindful that he was not to be a shedder of blood, fought with a "mace," with which he pounded his adversary to death, but did not hack him. In these latter days, when we deny the clergy the pleasures of the chase or war, their only participation in the latter is, that when blood is spilt in a way that is favourable to us, they are at liberty triumphantly to celebrate *Te Deums*, or, if it be spilt to our disadvantage, to offer supplications for more favourable issues, to the Lord of hosts; for Christianity differs in this respect from Paganism, that its God of peace, can, on fitting occasions, be converted into the God of war. Hence it is that less reverent of the Deity than the learned and pious Jew of Alexandria, who regarded a bellcose God as a figment, merely intended to suit the coarse conception of the vulgar, our

Christian divines are in frequent parley with the God of battles.* It is possibly to cover the semblance of an inconsistency on such occasions, that while in our churches the Jewish decalogue indispensably figures, the eleventh, and essentially Christian and peace-enjoining commandment, which is avowedly intended to supersede the rest, never finds a place. In the United States, indeed, where, until within a few years, war has been unnoticed or rarely known, the ignored commandment, less inconveniently obtrusive, though not displayed over the altar, does find a place in the liturgy of the Anglican Church, immediately after the decalogue; but this is the highest honour it has attained. The Quakers alone have doggedly stuck to a common-sense interpretation of Christianity; but as they have as unhappily stuck as doggedly to other things of a secondary nature, such as stand-up collars and drab cloth, hideous bonnets and dreary gowns, second-persons singular and rights of hat, they have justified the world in regarding them as merely eccentric, and so their valuable protest has been a cause of ridicule, rather than respect.† It is clear that if in the face of these facts, the Abbé Saint-Pierre had invoked international peace on Christian principles, or made any appeal in their name, he would have deserved to be laughed at for his pains. But he did nothing like this; he went to work in a much more sensible style. It is true, that when he laid before Cardinal Fleury the fundamental points of his scheme, the latter's remark was, "You should have added a sixth, to send out missionaries to convert the hearts of kings." Possibly Saint-Pierre thought these missionaries were slowly coming in the shape of the wants and wills of nations; but, working for the present on what materials he had, he did, what he thought, and what was better than appeal to the hearts of kings, he appealed to their interests. Relying on some passage in Sully's memoirs, he places his scheme of a European diet for the adjudication of international disputes under the sanction of Henry IV., who seems to have entertained some project of a Christian republic, which was to secure Europe against the overwhelming power of Austria, in which our Elizabeth is supposed to have taken an interest. But, little or much in it as there might be, it expired with the French King. This plan he professes to revive, and in most respects to follow, relying much, too, on the case of the Germanic diet. The work in which he expounds it is formal and dialectic in the extreme. He bases his system on five fundamental points, dividing each point into several propositions, which he treats in detail, raising objections and replying to them. A recent historian of repute endorses the opinion that the project originated "with a great politician, Henry IV.;" but is very angry at its having had for its expositor a writer not versed in human affairs, nor enough of a philosopher to "prescribe the conditions under which it could cease to be a dream, and become an idea." Fortunately he supplies us with the experience and philosophy which the problem requires, from which we learn that the error of Saint-Pierre was to desire to have his project realized by Europe as it then stood, whereas "such a confederacy is neither possible nor *desirable* until *nationalities* are freely constituted." But our critic should remember that the nostrum of nationality is a recent device; and that in no case did the most brilliant philosophy of the last century reckon among the desiderata, or conditions of progress, the decomposition and reconstruction of Europe on genealogical principles. On the whole we are of opinion that there was more of common-sense in the Abbé's conditions than in the historian's. For very good reasons Saint-Pierre had not nations in his mind; had it been otherwise, the Cardinal's remark would have been an opportune reminder. But, assuming kings to be the masters of nations, his arguments have reference to them alone. Led consequently, to consider the complete interests of sovereigns in all their bearings, he displays a large amount of historical and political knowledge, and no inconsiderable amount of ingenuity in applying it. He analyses the results of their many contests, and shows what a balance of loss and discomfiture there is against them. Turning then to what has been done within nations, he infers the possibilities of what may be done between them. He desires kings as lords paramount to consider what in times gone by has been done by those miniatures of them—their great vassals, who have foregone the jeopardy of war for the security of peace.

"If two lords," he says, "are at variance with each other, they do not collect an army, neither they, nor their kindred, nor their friends, nor their domestics, nor their vassals. They trust neither their lives nor their fortunes to the chances of a battle. To obtain justice they are not obliged to be at the charge of an armament which would cost them twenty times the thing they contended for. They are not obliged to support a ruinous expense for many years. They go to a tribunal to whose award they must submit; but how came they by that great advantage? By being members of a permanent *society strong enough to enforce control.*"

This reasoning is good. Men are ever apt to regard facts accomplished as things of course, though as great miracles in their way, as anything which the most sanguine imagination can predict. The two lords of Saint-Pierre excite anything but surprise and indicate to us little in the way of future or even past results; but the fault is entirely our own. If we would be at the pains of studying history as it should be studied, that is, for the purpose of ascertaining the origin of the actual phenomena of society, we should discover that many facts

* We are shocked, not surprised, at hearing of the frightful parody of this species of thanksgiving for successful slaughter, recently performed by the blacks in Jamaica immediately after their most brutal massacre. They, like monkeys, but mimic what they see.

† It is right, however, to say that these peculiarities are no longer obligatory; nevertheless, at Liverpool in October last, a Quaker, to the great indignation of Baron Bramwell, insisted, while giving evidence, on his right of hat.

which are now familiar and matters-of-course, have emerged out of a condition of things which, at one time or other, made their advent highly improbable, and their development painfully difficult. Of this kind is the extinction of that right of private war to which Saint-Pierre alludes.

Whoever doubts it may find the evidence at hand in the interesting note (xxi.) which Robertson has appended to his view of the state of Europe in his Life of Charles V. There is no custom, he tells us, in the middle ages more singular than that of private war. "It was a right so important and of such extensive prevalence that the regulations affecting it occupy a considerable space in the system of law during the middle ages." It was a right jealously guarded; sometimes a powerful sovereign impinged upon it, but at his death there is immediate demand for the full restitution of the right. Churchmen, as well as laymen, asserted it. The great monasteries and bishops had in their service powerful barons, under the names of Advocati or Vidames, who were bound to protect the sacred possessions of the Church flamma, ferro, cæde — a singular commission from a religion which sanctifies poverty and enjoins peace. The objects for which they might contend in this holy warfare were formally indicated, as were the persons whom they might summon to their standard. When the Church prohibited marriage to the seventh degree, the Vidames might demand the service of their kinsmen to the seventh degree. When the limit of prohibition extended no farther than the fourth degree, the right of summons shrank within the same limits. Everything was according to regulation as precise as that of our War-Office. In Germany this privilege of private war was more conspicuous even than in France. Now it is manifest that when this right was in its palmiest state anyone who should have predicted its extinction, and especially the manner of that extinction, would have been regarded as a Saint-Pierre—a dreamer; it did, however, terminate—and through what agency? By the agency of the majority of those who claimed the right to exercise it—for the simple reason that it became a nuisance to them, and they found it to their interest to suppress it. It was abandoned in an improved condition of society which, finding an advantage in repose, desired a substitute for the arbitrament of war. For the final manifestation of the right is exhibited in the form of powerful combinations of chieftains entitled to this prerogative, against such of their body as refused to consent to its abolition. Not very unreasonably, then, might Saint-Pierre infer that by the same process, and for similar reasons, the right of war, now admitted as between nations, would one day be put down like the right of war within them. But if reason was on the side of Saint-Pierre, prejudice was against him. His arguments were rejected because they were not weighed. To no man indeed, more fitly than to him, can we apply what D'Argenson says of an old writer unfavourably criticised but little read:—"*On le denie justice, parcequ'on lui refuse audience.*" Saint-Pierre, in consequence, passed away with this project of peace as a blemish on his reputation, causing him to be remembered as nothing more than a dreamer.

But in this, as in other cases, time brings with it a reversal of unjust judgments. A little more than a century elapses, when, in a neighbouring country, a very distinguished man, regarded as anything but a dreamer, draws up an indictment against international war. That man was Richard Cobden. In a characteristic way he wrote a letter to the excellent and benevolent Joseph Sturge, sympathising with the peace movement, in which he reminded the world that the noble pastime of war cost Europe about £200,000,000 a year. The accession of such a leader gave a new stimulus to the peace societies. On the 12th of June, 1849, petitions signed by 200,000 persons were presented to the House of Commons praying it to adopt arbitration for the settlement of international disputes. On the same day, Mr. Cobden made a motion to that effect, which was met by Lord Palmerston moving the previous question, and carrying it by a majority of 176 against 79. The defeat was a matter of course. But the general tone of the debate and the importance of the constituencies represented by the minority were accepted as harbingers of approaching success. There was now a perfect jubilee—vast excursion trains carried hundreds of peace delegates for three successive years, 1848, 1849, and 1850, from England to foreign capitals, where, joined by delegates from different parts, they assembled in solemn congress, to agitate against international war. They reached these capitals, not entirely as unrecognised individuals, but, in some sort, as official representatives. When they crossed the frontier no custom-house officer dared molest their luggage, no passport inspector dispute their passage. The broad ticket that proclaimed their membership was a sufficient answer to all inquiries, and a satisfaction of all forms; while they held their session they had free access to all public institutions; hotels were gorged—in some instances, as at Frankfort, private families accepted them as billeted lodgers;—humble delegates, who had never left their native towns, and of little importance in them, felt themselves elevated to the rank of ambassadors, while eminent men, who had played distinguished parts in their respective countries, came to join them as colleagues in their great work. Never did a public movement assume a more noble presence—never was one honoured by a more distinguished homage. In England its foundation was broad and solid. At its head a man of renown, whose pride it was to have gained a great victory over an established policy supported by a powerful class; a successful agitator of immense force. In his first agitation he had had to work his way from small beginnings through vast obstructions, and in defiance of great opponents. In his second, the materials of at least a great approach to victory were ready-made to his hand. The object was avowedly one which all men desired; the time apparently opportune for it, as far as could be judged from the distinguished honour accorded to its missionaries; the following devoted to it in this country considerable; the deference of

the government to his new views so great as to be the occasion of party satire. Nevertheless, in spite of these concurrent advantages, the able agitator signally failed—failed so signally as to throw back into ridicule a cause which had conquered so much respect. And why was this? Because he utterly misconceived the point at which he ought to aim, and the means by which alone he could successfully operate. Herein it that he contrasts so unfavourably with Saint-Pierre. The aim of the latter, as we have seen, was to devise some powerful check upon war. He proposed to make France that check, and for this reason he made it a capital point that France, as a great military power, should be strong. He desired that she should have a vast command of force, not for war, but against war. He wished to make her the great peace-officer of Europe—ready to aid in behalf of those who desired to keep the peace against those that desired to break it. Now, if it were chimerical in Saint-Pierre to suppose his country could be made to assume this office, it was not so to suppose that could she be persuaded to do it, there would at once be created an immense impediment to international war. Far more chimerical and inconsequent were Mr. Cobden's views and policy. Instead of assuming with Saint-Pierre that there was everywhere a disposition to war, or the possibility at any moment of a disposition to war, he strangely assumed that there was a disposition to war nowhere, and that it was simply the fact of one great nation being armed that provoked other nations to be equally armed. A more extraordinary misconception never forced itself into an able man's brain. One great nation, indeed, there was in the supposed predicament, which was armed to the teeth solely because other nations were armed, and which had no inclination for war, for the very good reason that she had an immense interest in peace; with an enormous empire more than sufficient to satisfy her wants, preservation, not acquisition, must, of necessity, be her policy; and with a vast commerce and a vast industrial production as the sources of her wealth, her perpetual need must be unmolested repose. England, in fact, was the postulate that Saint-Pierre's problem required; a great country of formidable power, armed only in the interests of peace, and thus preserving, and in a manner imposing, peace. But, with a want of sagacity which is perfectly surprising, Mr. Cobden, utterly overlooking the advantages of such a position, began his operations against war by an attempt to cripple the power which was the best guarantee of peace. "Reduce your armaments," he said to a country having, of all other, the greatest inducements not to go to war, "and other nations," not having the same inducements, "will do the same." The inference was by no means clear; under any circumstances it would be highly improbable, under actual circumstances quite impossible. For there is a fact which seems never to have presented itself to Mr. Cobden's mind which renders the truth of such an inference impossible, and which, by making it impossible, inflicts a peculiar hardship upon England; and that fact is, that the armaments of the continental nations have as much or more reference to their domestic, than to their foreign relations. Take France, for instance. It is notorious that she keeps up her immense army neither from fear of invasion nor desire of conquest, but for the purpose of political tranquillity within, supplemented by a powerful navy, because it is vital to the government to present on every side an aspect of great power. Nevertheless, as long as that army and navy may, without violation of international law, be let loose upon other nations at any time for any purpose, even to satisfy some momentary exigency of internal politics, they have no choice but to be prepared against such a contingency.—Hence, a peace-requiring country like England is compelled to put itself to the enormous expense of being a great military power, simply because France or some other leading nation is ill governed, or refuses to be well governed, and so must justly or unjustly be kept in order by a prodigious accumulation of force, *easily diverted to war.* Had not Mr. Cobden overlooked this fact, he would not have made the sad mistake of supposing that the armed condition of the Continent was a mere matter of rivalry, precaution, or choice; had he observed it, he could have adduced it as an irresistible reason why England should require such a change in international law as to release her from the oppressive consequences it involved.

But ill-judged as were Mr. Cobden's proceedings, so great was his influence, and that of the idea he represented, that the ministry yielded as far as it dared to his demands. So firm a hold, indeed, did he and the peace party seem to have on the nation, as to suggest an opinion, at the time, that the Emperor of Russia would not have hazarded a war had he not, misled by appearances, conceived that England was bound over to adhere to peace at any price. But the idea, if ever entertained by him, was absurd. England for a while tolerated a misdirected movement of which she solemnly approved the aim, but her common-sense revolted against the injudicious means which had been used to advance it. The interest in the movement itself abated, as the national displeasure against the proposed method of its accomplishment increased, and a sudden ridicule was thrown over a cause which had recently been an object of respect. Never was anything more unfortunate. Had Mr. Cobden adopted the statesmanlike views of Saint-Pierre—had he used his ascendancy to induce the English nation to require that it should be from that moment the unflagging duty of every administration, while maintaining to the uttermost a capacity of force, to devote itself to the discovery of the means of superseding international war, and to press upon all other governments the expediency of doing so, it is inconceivable what an amount of good he would have done. There cannot be a doubt that the then existing ministry, hampered by his unwelcome policy, would have been but too glad to give such a pledge; and the work once begun would never have ceased until it had accomplished its end. By not doing this, and doing what he did, Mr. Cobden compromised the cause he had at heart. But let us note to his honour that he had it at heart. Well

does the writer of these lines remember meeting him on his way to the House when some critical decision was to be taken respecting the Russian war. They had been fellow-labourers in the good cause. Cobden was manifestly very nervous, and expressed his displeasure at the prospect of war. The writer reminded him that though, like himself, an advocate of the peace movement, he had always affirmed that we should at all times be prepared for war, and that in the absence of any faculty of appeal, it might be even expedient to go to war. Cobden was silent for a moment—his eyes became slightly suffused, and pressing the writer's hand in parting, he said, "Well, I am sure we both earnestly agree in desiring to have peace if we can." He left the impression of being conscious of having missed his way.

But though a golden opportunity was lost, we need not despair. That nations can go on much longer strenuously competing with each other for the best modes of slaughter—that they will continue earnestly, and at vast expense, to waste their time and resources in weighing the respective merits of guns and targets—that they will persist in regarding as benefactors, Armstrongs, Whitworths, and other artificers of implements of destruction, cannot be admitted by any one who has faith in human progress. Surely the time cannot be very far off when some one will arise with influence as great as Cobden's, and judgment far superior, who will persuade his country to make itself the antagonist of this stupendous folly. Even at the moment we are writing comes Mr. Gladstone's address at Glasgow, in which, with his usual ability, he indicates the causes of war, and fastens the mark of Cain upon it. There is no fatality about it, he judiciously reminds us. It does not come by visitations of God. It is simply the result of unbridled passions or unprincipled greed exhibiting themselves now in one form, now in another—religious, dynastic, territorial, or commercial. The picture is faithful but not flattering. In spite of all our efforts to conceal it from ourselves, war is a foul nuisance; one of those antique nuisances to which men continue to submit simply because they have submitted to them, which they think interminable, simply because they have not yet terminated, but which public aversion, ripening with public intelligence, does some day cause to disappear as if by magic. Meanwhile we must be content to express our gratitude to those who, according to the measure of their abilities or their means, have been enlightened and resolute enough to protest against its continuance. Verily their places will be among the Paladins of History.

Such, on the important questions we have been considering, were the views of the Abbé Saint-Pierre. When, then, we remember what these views were, what a comprehensive field of inquiry they embraced, when we reflect on the spirit of truth which directed his researches and *discoveries*, as D'Argenson calls them, his opinions of the duties of kings, his earnest and enlightened concern for the welfare of the people, and the clear and manifest consequences to which such sentiments must inevitably lead, it will be difficult to persuade ourselves that they who were so willing to hear him, were not themselves far gone in that deep and earnest passion for political and social reform which was the master principle of his mind. Had we then, no other evidence but this of Saint-Pierre's connexion with the Club, and the manifest consideration he obtained in it, we should be quite justified in ascribing to its members a bold reforming zeal, far outrunning the laggard spirit of their times. But we have other and conclusive evidence. In the writings of the Marquis D'Argenson, to whom we are indebted for what we know of its organization and proceedings, we have ample testimony to the fact.

In his very able work at the head of this article, M. Cornelius de Witt has given us a highly interesting sketch of this very remarkable man, whom he summons as one of his three witnesses to the condition of French society in the eighteenth century. His memoirs have of late years been published, including a very remarkable journal, in which, with the openness of Pepys, he exhibits himself in the nude, giving expression to his inmost thoughts on the events and persons of his day. He gives us this picture of himself:—"I put my heart into everything I do, for or against; whether the objects be things or men, I am a warm supporter or a hot opponent. Those who know me best can give no other account of me than this:—heart excellent; head less good than the heart; tongue the worst of all." A blunt description, somewhat too deeply shaded, but in the main correct. Two qualities he omitted—truthfulness and probity. "Never," says Voltaire, "was there an honester man, or one more truly attached to his king and country." His weakness was his over anxiety to be prime minister, for the purpose of doing good to his country. He eventually became minister, but found it impossible to attain his end. M. de Witt, in his estimate of D'Argenson's capacity as a statesman, and his views as a politician, differs from M. Henri Martin, who thinks that of a statesman he had all the necessaries, but not the accessories, and represents him as almost a Republican in his innovations and a precursor of Rousseau. To this M. de Witt demurs. As respects his statesmanship, the latter writer justly remarks, that whatever may have been the breadth of his views, he was totally deficient in that faculty of practical application, without which the most enlightened policy becomes unprofitable in a minister's hands. For Republicanism he certainly had no respect, though many of his opions were such as a Republican would gladly adopt. Nothing in him is so conspicuous as his unswerving attachment to royalty—nothing more touching, as M. de Witt remarks, than to watch his robust faith in monarchy as it struggles to preserve itself intact, in defiance of the foul and disgusting royalty of the reigning king; now wavering, now recovering itself; hoping against hope, even while giving utterance to these marvellous apprehensions some thirty years before the ever-memorable date of 1789. "The time," he says, "of adoration is past; the word master, so welcome to our ancestors, grates harshly

on our ears. . . . . I have in my time seen the respect and love of the people for royalty decline. . . . . Now-a-days, all the orders are simultaneously discontented. . . . . Combustible matter in every direction. From a riot we may proceed to a revolt, from a revolt to a thorough revolution—to the election of real tribunes of the people, of consuls, of comitiæ, to the stripping kings and ministers of their excessive power of doing mischief." Prophetic foresight! of which had those blind agents, the Mirabeaus and Sieyes of a later day, possessed but a tittle, they would never have stood on the brink of a volcano without suspecting it—would never have showered down their fiery words on what they thought an inert, but which D'Argenson knew was a highly explosive mass.

That his political speculations were communicated to the Club and offered to their consideration, there can be no manner of doubt. He has himself told us that in the distributions of literary subjects among such of the members as chose to undertake them, the subject assigned to him was a treatise on 'Le Droit Public,' which was afterwards narrowed down to a 'Histoire de Droit Ecclesiastique Français.' Another subject bore the title, 'Traité de la Démocratie dans un état monarchique.' This is said to be the work we now have under the title of 'Considérations sur le Gouvernment Ancien et Présent de la France.' It is a curious proof of the rapidity with which opinions will sometimes pass from the speculative to the practical, that, alluding to the sentiments and views contained in this work, Voltaire observed of D'Argenson that he was fitted to be "a secretary of state in the republic of Plato," meaning, of course, to pay a high compliment to the nobleness of his views, and at the same time to mark their impracticability. A few years elapse, and the Assemby of Notables has the work in question printed at its own expense, as containing valuable practical instruction to the nation on points of pressing and immediate concern. This was in 1787. In little more than fifty years the theories which had only been fit "for the republic of Plato" were being reduced to practice by the congregated notabilities of France.

Of this work we cannot give a juster idea than by repeating what has been correctly said of it, that its title ought properly to be—'To what extent Democracy can be admitted into a Monarchy.' Such, unquestionably, is the bearing of the book, which seems to identify it with the academic work alluded to. Its author does not, indeed, propose by any formal provision to abridge the power and prerogative of the crown; far from it, he only prescribed to it the duty of having but one rule of action—the interests of the people; but then he points out the necessity and means of giving energy and effect to the will of the people, and he insists on the total abrogation of those aristocratical privileges which in France presented so formidable an obstruction to their progress and prosperity. He wishes, like Mirabeau at a later period, to have but two great elements of the state in presence—the crown and the nation; but he took a superb view of the relation between them. He called attention to the fact that in establishing any new institutions the king's rights are the only things considered; public utility never. "The more, however," he boldly exclaims, "we consider the monarch relatively to his subjects, the more we become sensible that he is the man of the people, and not the people the property of the king." Who does not see that the French Revolution had begun? And if we pass on for a moment to the meeting of the States-General, the first scene of the first act of that memorable tragedy, and observe the great struggle there was respecting the form of voting, and wonder that the nobility did not, at all hazards, insist upon recording their votes as a distinct and independent body, our surprise will cease on learning that eminent men of their own order had already proposed to reduce them to the ranks, and to place them in all legislative respects on a mere equality with the Tiers. In the remarkable work we are considering, there is a remarkable part of it which the most celebrated of French political writers, the late M. de Tocqueville, would agree with us might be beneficially studied by the actual statesmen and legislators of his country, where the author contends that the people are the best guardians of their municipal and local interests, and proposes an admirable plan of reorganizing the provincial estates with a view to this purpose, on a purely popular and representative principle. He would make a partial exception to this principle by admitting the proprietors of every considerable domain, as holders of such property, to sit and vote in those assemblies. But mark how they are to sit there—not as a separate order, not with distinct powers, but merely recording their votes as simple individuals, entirely undistinguished in this respect from other members sitting as representatives of the people. It is worthy of being observed, too, that a similar exception was made in favour of certain persons who were to be admissible as the deputies of the crown on behalf of any lands it might possess within the jurisdiction of the estates; but though the personal representatives of the monarch, they were to sit and vote as simple members, and nothing more. A very bold and stringent application of the rule. This is striking enough, and if we add to this that D'Argenson, like Saint-Pierre, proposed that all aristocratic exemptions should be suppressed; that privileges should be merely honorary; that no proof of nobility should be hereafter required as a necessary qualification for obtaining any distinction or office in the state—a monstrous practice which contributed more than any single event to the French Revolution, and more especially to the malignant character of it—and that even the crown property should be alienated to buy up that pernicious multitude of venal offices, or charges as they were called, which fearfully embarrassed the administration of justice, and produced the most serious inconvenience to the state, we see at once the deadly blow which opinion had aimed at a worn-out and over-privileged aristocracy from the lips of men of its own order, and that the great democratic suggestions which took a practical shape at the end of the century had been foreshadowed by

able aristocrats when yet little more than half of it had expired. Our surprise at the unexpected apparition of a Lafayette will cease, when we know that he was only a D'Argenson in action, with more of energy and less of knowledge and ability. Under either name we have the same group of ideas and sentiments, only differently developed according to the difference of the times; manifested speculatively before the hour of action came, practically when it did come. D'Argenson is Lafayette preparing the Revolution. Lafayette is D'Argenson consummating it.

When we reflect that the author of these remarkable, or, we may safely say, revolutionary opinions, was a member, and a very leading one, of the Club of the Entresol; that Saint-Pierre, with views perfectly similar, bore exactly the same relation to it, it is impossible not to feel that it had fixed its attention upon a future big with the elements of change, and that its object was to pave the way for their salutary and safe approach. We can well understand why foreigners receiving exaggerated reports of its projects, and dreading their diffusion among themselves, denounced it to the government as a proper object of its suspicions and fears; and why Fleury, willing at first to favour it, felt himself compelled at last to bring it to a close, having doubtless very good reasons for what he says, namely, that it was in the nature of these occupations to carry those who pursued them farther than they at first intended. Hence it was that D'Argenson, impatient of the sybaritic philosophy which doats on every kind of good while it is speculative, but whose delicate nerves are shocked at the mere idea of reducing it to practice, satirically says, "We must live for ourselves alone. We must look for good actions only in dreams, or in the heroes of romance or in the drama, but the moment we wish practically to realize what we *may* admire at a distance, this is regarded as the supreme of absurdity." Hence, too, it was, that when pointing out the difference between the Club of the Entresol and that political academy which at one time met at the Louvre under the patronage of M. de Torcy, he remarks that the latter "was formed to push on the personal fortunes of its members, in their way to the political appointments of the government; the former, on the contrary, had no other object than the consideration of subjects beneficial to the state, no other purpose than that of doing gratuitous good." Both these extracts might have been written by Saint-Pierre—they breathe the same scorn of those effeminate minds that will not strive to realize the good they are willing to admit; the same confidence in the possibility of working out that good; and the same generous and firm devotion to the interest of others and of all. It is clear that the spirit of this excellent, able, and, until these days, underrated man, had largely penetrated into the breasts of his associates, and filled them with the influence of his amiable and exalted views. As far as D'Argenson was concerned, this was eminently the case. The peace policy of Saint-Pierre had so much become his own, that he was often designated Peace-d'Argenson (D'Argenson de la Paix). True to his faith in this respect, he entered upon his ministry, determined to commit France to a policy of peace to which neither king nor courtiers were inclined; and partial to the principle of confederation, his great anxiety was to establish a powerful Italian confederacy, after the manner of the Germanic Diet, to Italianize all foreign princes ruling in Italy—that is, to require that they should not hold any possessions out of its territory,—and also to relieve it from all subordination to the Pope. This great scheme was, indeed, the occasion of his fall. Spain took umbrage at it, and the French king, reckless and indifferent, without principle, without purpose, first supported his minister, and finally sacrificed him to the displeasure of the Spanish court. "The sage and virtuous D'Argenson," as M. Henri Martin observes, "was quite out of place in the cabinet of Louis XV., and the surprise is, not that he did not remain in office, but that he ever got there." Save for the objects he had in view, it gave him no concern whatever to quit it, and he cheerfully returned to that private station which by his acquirements, his occupations, and his estimable qualities, he so well knew how to enjoy and adorn, spending his time between agreeable society and retirement, which was still more agreeable to him; or, as he himself expressed it, "entre la bonne compagnie, et une meilleure encore, qui est, la retraite."

Such, then, were the two thoughtful, far-seeing men, whose views were regarded as dreams because they soared higher and pierced deeper into the future than the feeble or self-directed vision of those who were masters of power. Yet—and this is the most instructive consideration of all—they were but exponents of ideas and aims that must have been silently forming and maturing through the length and breadth of France. For if we examine the remarkable *cahiers* — the customary forms under which each of the three orders in every province was wont to complain of grievances, or desire reforms—which were presented to the States-General at their opening in 1789, we shall be astonished at the character of their requisitions, especially as coming, many of them, from the order to which they belonged. Thus we find the nobles spontaneously sacrificing that unjust privilege of exemption from taxation so odious to D'Argenson and Saint-Pierre; we find them asking for the protection of personal liberty; for elective municipalities everywhere; for obliteration of all relics of serfage; for a gradual preparation for emancipating the West Indian blacks; for the general practice of granting long leases; for the diminution of large farms as being injurious to the poor; for religious toleration; for the abolition of all taxes on commerce, manufactures, and trade; for national education, for trial by jury; and for unrestricted liberty of the press. Superb materials these for a noble, intelligent, and peaceful revolution, very different from that mad orgy in which, to use the strong expression of Byron,

"——France got drunk with blood to vomit crime,"

leaving behind it a vertigo which, to this hour, has incapacitated her from fully availing herself of those invaluable reforms which her nobles suggested nearly a century ago. So then it is, that when convulsions are approaching by which the ancient institutions of states are upheaved, riven, and overthrown, and long before they are foreseen, they are preceded by certain eddies of opinion, which show that the habitual and regular state of the moral atmosphere is about to be destroyed. The minds in which they are manifested, however, instead of being supposed to indicate any secret derangement of its elements, are mocked at and spurned as obeying some capricious and spontaneous action of their own. Nor is it till after the disturbance is visible and the storm has burst, that men remember the direction in which they moved, and first perceive that, by some peculiar sensibility of their nature, they were influenced by those light premonitory currents which are ever incapable affecting the grosser spirits of the mass. Such minds, especially in periods of transition, are always to be found, and the fate of that government is to be deplored that does not gather wisdom and warning from their movements, however anomalous or fantastic they may appear.

Art. III.—Lord Palmerston.

The Life and Death of Lord Palmerston. London: Routledge and Sons. 1865.

Unquestionably Lord Palmerston was one of the really remarkable men of his day. In the sphere of politics, by reason of his office as Prime Minister of England, he stood in the foremost rank of men. But over and above this *ex officio* distinction, he claims notice on account of his long and successful career, on account of the qualities which impelled him to, and sustained him in that career, and on account of the world-wide influence exercised by the official acts for which he was responsible. The odium to which he was exposed in foreign countries, while it helped to sustain his popularity in his own country, increases the difficulty which contemporaries have had in arriving at a right judgment upon his character and conduct. The judgment of posterity will be more deliberate, and doubtless more correct than any that we may arrive at. We mean not, therefore, to enter into competition with our descendants, but rather to supply materials for their use in the sketch we propose to give of the career of Lord Palmerston.

In a country like England, where the aristocracy still possess so large a share of political power, it was no small advantage to the late Premier to be of good birth. His inheritance of an Irish peerage, while it kept him out of the Elysian Fields of the House of Lords, gave him a high social position, and permitted his entrance into that field of active political life in which he ultimately gained the highest prize. The young Viscount of 1803 was not without the prestige of ancient descent. The ancestry of the Temples were distinguished personages in the remote days of the Saxon Heptarchy before the reign of King Alfred.

After the Norman Conquest the great Saxon nobles were shorn of their possessions and dignities. The Earls of Leicester became simple lords of Temple, the name affixed to lands which had once been given by the Earls of Leicester to the Knights Templar, and which subsequently reverted to the descendants of the former. It does not appear on the record that the great rebel and radical leader of the thirteenth century, Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, had any other relationship with the Temples than the possession of their old title. It might please the fancy of some antiquary to trace a blood-connexion between the disturber of Europe in the thirteenth century and the "remueur" of the nineteenth. The fortunes of the family appear to have decayed, but vital energy did not fail the race. "Flecti, non frangi" is their motto, "Bent, not broken," and well have they redeemed the pledge it gives to fortune, that the Temples will not be easily cast down. When wealth and broad lands were no longer theirs they turned to learning, to labour, and to action, for the maintenance of life and honour. In the reign of Queen Elizabeth, of two brothers, John and Anthony Temple, the first succeeded to the family estate at Stow, and was the progenitor of the present Duke of Buckingham and Chandos, while the second gave birth to the line which ends in Lord Palmerston. William, the son of Anthony Temple, was a proficient in learning, became Master of a Free School in the city of Lincoln, and subsequently secretary to the heroic Sir Philip Sidney, who died in his arms at Zutphen. Mr. Temple inherited from his illustrious friend a bequest of 30*l.* a year, and the favour of the great Earl of Essex. The death of the latter upon the scaffold exposed all his friends to the enmity of Mr. Secretary Cecil; and Temple, to escape his resentment, retired into Ireland, where his worth and learning caused him to be nominated Provost of the University of Dublin. The stock thus planted on a new soil made a fresh start towards rank and wealth. Mr. Temple was knighted, and his early studies in the law were rewarded by an office in the Irish Chancery. His son, Sir John, became an eminent lawyer and judge (Master of the Rolls), and showed the same practical ability and remarkable power of adapting himself to changing times and circumstances without dishonour that seems to have belonged to the race. Physical vigour also was theirs then as it has been in later times. Sir John died at the age of seventy-seven, his father, Sir William, at seventy-three. Sir John's son and successor was William, the eminent statesman and diplomatist, and the friend of William III., the author and promoter of the "Triple Alliance," which proved so great a check to the ambitious projects of Louis XIV. He died in his seventieth year. His brother, Sir John, a lawyer and politician, was Speaker of the Irish House of

Commons, and was held in such general esteem by his contemporaries, that Archbishop Sheldon paid him this singular compliment, "That he had the curse of the gospel, for all men spoke well of him." He reached the seventy-second year of his life, and was the father of the Henry Temple who, in 1722, was created by King George I. Baron Temple and Viscount Palmerston, of Palmerston, in the Irish peerage.

We have purposely noticed the advanced age attained by various members of the Temple family, because longevity is at least some proof of soundness in the physical constitution. The first Lord Palmerston lived to his eighty-fourth year, survived his eldest son, and dying in 1757, was succeeded by his grandson, the father of the late Premier, making the latter but the third Viscount, although the title dated from 1722, and its first possessor, the late lord's great-grandfather, was born in 1673, when Charles II. was king.

Henry John Temple was born in Park-street, Westminster, on the 20th of October, 1784. His mother was Miss Mary Mee, of Bath, who appears to have gained her noble husband in a somewhat romantic manner. The second Lord Palmerston, it is related, was thrown from his horse, and carried in a dangerous state into the house of Mr. Benjamin Mee. Too ill to be removed, he was tenderly cared for by Mr. Mee's daughter, with whom he gratefully fell in love, and, being a widower of fourteen years' standing, married. This second Viscount was faithful to the political creed he had inherited, and held office under the Marquis of Rockingham. It was the violent alarm and reaction caused in England by the French Revolution, that converted so many of the liberal nobility into Tories. Under the influence of the reaction young Temple grew up. He enjoyed all the opportunities of a liberal culture. He went to Harrow school; after that to Edinburgh, where he attended the lectures of Dugald Stewart, and he finally graduated Master of Arts at St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1806. He never pretended to much scholarship. His abilities were good, but they were not much devoted to book-learning. Indeed his schooling began later than is usual with boys, and his entrance into life was earlier than is usual with men. It used to be a reproach urged by her neighbours in Hampshire against his mother, that she kept Henry too long in the nursery. He was a big fellow, it is said, of eleven years of age, before he was released from that gentle petticoat government to pass under the ferule of tutors and professors. Tardy development of character is, indeed, one key to the secret of his envied vigour in old age. On the other hand, he was only eighteen years old when his father died, and young Henry became the third Viscount Palmerston. Handsome, gay, and clever, with a strong dash of Irish fervour in his temperament, there can be no doubt that the young lord's entrance into society was a decided success, and that his claim to the title of "Cupid" was stronger at that period of his life, than when later in his career it was applied to him as a nickname.

However this may be, his talents and his profession of the Tory faith made him of sufficient importance to be selected by that party as their representative in an important struggle. On the death of Pitt, in 1806, Fox became Prime Minister, and young Lord Henry Petty, the late Marquis of Lansdowne, was made Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Parliamentary representation of the University of Cambridge was also vacant, and Lord Henry became the popular candidate. The Tories set up Lord Palmerston, a still younger man, as an opposition candidate, but in vain. Indeed, Lord Palmerston's attempts to enter the House, to which afterwards he became so much attached, were unfortunate. He was returned to the new Parliament that assembled in December, 1806, as member for Horsham, but by a double return, and on petition, was unseated. He again started for Cambridge University at the election in 1807, and was defeated, together with his former antagonist, Lord Henry Petty. He did, however, obtain a seat that year, and commenced his long career as a member of the House of Commons by representing the borough of Newport, Isle of Wight, which was then under the influence of the Worsley family. Two years later he became Secretary at War, a post which he retained for nearly twenty years. The Secretary at War was not a *Cabinet* Minister at that time, and Lord Palmerston confined himself mainly to his necessary duties in the House of Commons, speaking there only on business connected with his office—army estimates, army reforms (which he always opposed), and other matters of a subordinate description. He served under the six successive Prime Ministers, all of the Tory party, who ruled this country from 1807 till 1830, seldom troubling himself to defend their general policy, and content to give them a silent vote. In 1818 he had a narrow escape from death by assassination. A half-pay officer, Lieutenant Davies, of the 62nd regiment of foot, fired a pistol at the Secretary, who was ascending the stairs of the War Office. The bullet perforated the coat in the middle of the back, passed upwards, and glanced off at his lordship's shoulder-blade, without causing any serious injury. The assassin was immediately seized, and exclaimed to the doorkeeper of the office, "You know my wrongs! I have killed him!" What these wrongs were we have not been able to ascertain. Davies, on his trial, was treated as a lunatic. This incident, which might have terminated Lord Palmerston's career while he was in comparative obscurity, seems to have attracted little notice. It is indeed singular how rarely we find the name of the future Prime Minister in the many volumes of gossiping correspondence that have been published to illustrate the time of the regency and the reign of George IV. Once we find him mentioned as an intimate friend of that monarch's unfortunate consort, Caroline of Brunswick, whom he used to visit and play chess with when, as Princess of Wales, she resided at Kensington. The description of him at this time merits citation:—

"Lord Palmerston pays the princess great court:

he is not a man to despise any person or thing by which he can hope to gain power: he has set his heart thereon, and most likely he will succeed in his ambition, like all those who fix their minds steadily to the pursuit of one object; though, except a pleasing address, it does not appear that he has any great claim to distinction. There is one strange circumstance connected with him—namely, that though he is suave and pleasant in his manner, he is unpopular. The princess is not really partial to him, but conciliates his favour."

This passage reveals the wary, watchful politician. His "hope to gain power" was long deferred, but the delay did not, as the proverb requires, make his heart sick. For twenty years he submitted patiently to the yoke of men whom possibly he despised, for he was learning his trade—learning to be adroit in fencing off troublesome questions, skilful in winning friends, artful in making the worse appear the better cause. These accomplishments he acquired and improved, not only in the House of Commons, or at the War Office, but in society amid the men, and especially among the women, of rank and fashion, whose countenance and favour did more to bring him into notice than even his undoubted general talent. At length he felt himself strong enough to be independent. He had served under so many chiefs that the world, maybe, thought him perfectly indifferent as to who the Prime Minister might be and what his opinions. Yet he revolted against one of the greatest English warriors and the most absolute Minister of the age. He grounded his resignation, too, upon the state of his opinions. The occasion was the resignation of Mr. Huskisson, after his adverse vote on the "East Retford Disfranchisement Bill"—a matter that appeared very trifling for so momentous a change as the withdrawal of two or three Ministers from the Cabinet, but which involved principles of general policy and of Ministerial and Parliamentary government that largely affected subsequent history. As this is a topic with which our readers are tolerably familiar, a word or two of explanation will suffice. The followers of Canning, who represented what is now called Liberal-Conservative opinions, had joined the Ministry of Wellington on the understanding that their opinions were to be allowed their fair share of influence in the Cabinet counsels. Huskisson, who was the leader of the Canningites, soon discovered that the old Tory party, headed by Wellington and Peel, were not over desirous of conceding anything to the spirit of reform then spreading through the country. After voting against Peel on the question abovementioned, Huskisson thought it but courteous to offer his resignation to the Prime Minister, fully expecting that his offer would be declined. Wellington, however, took him at his word, and laid the offer of resignation before the King. Huskisson demanded an audience of the King, and being by the advice of Wellington refused, he resigned. Lords Dudley and Palmerston, who had served with Canning and professed his opinions, followed in the wake of their friend, and the world laughed at the military manner in which the Iron Duke had taught them all the value of discipline. The recalcitrants were not, however, men to submit to undue exercise of authority. Huskisson said on the occasion:*—

"God forbid that any man should ever be a Secretary of State and agree to be admitted to the Sovereign only when, and as the Prime Minister might permit. He might indeed be the chief clerk—the head-manager of a great executive department, but he could no longer be a Minister of State and a confidential adviser of his Sovereign."

When Mr. Huskisson had finished an unusually long speech, and had been answered by Mr. Secretary Peel, up rose Viscount Palmerston, and in plain, straightforward language expressed his approval of what Mr. Huskisson had done, and his own intention of doing the same. And here we get at something like a public profession of political faith:—

"My main reason," he said, "for joining the Government formed by the noble Duke, was the confidence I felt in my right honourable friend being a member of it. I have very strong feelings relative to certain general principles, of the greater part of which my right honourable friend has been the powerful advocate. I had not the presumption to suppose that I could myself give effect to any particular system, but while my honourable friend was in the Cabinet I knew I was safe."

The principles here alluded to were those of Mr. Canning, the Minister who aimed a blow at Absolutism in Europe by first acknowledging the independence of the Spanish republics in South America. It was in the speech we have been quoting from that the following passage occurred:—

"The manner in which our foreign relations have for some years been managed has raised this country to a point of proved pre-eminence which in no former period of our history has been surpassed and rarely equalled. This situation has not been gained by lawless violence, but by the confidence inspired by our justice, moderation, and the enlightened wisdom of our councils. It is this that has gained us the respect of the civilized world, and made the King of this country to be chosen the arbiter of other States, and to be placed in a situation of greater dignity than was ever attained by the conqueror who lately ruled France."

These words, uttered at a time when the speaker was voluntarily quitting office without any near prospect of returning to it, and when no anticipation of holding the seals of the Foreign Office could have seriously occupied his mind, is an unconscious revelation of Palmerston's real leanings in foreign policy, and were significant of that remarkable system of meddling intervention which he subsequently attempted to establish when Minister of Foreign Affairs. He evidently admired Mr. Canning's manner and conduct as being always "spirited," and he strove to imitate it. Canning had said in a fine, boastful way, *apropos* of British aid to Portugal, "We go to plant the standard of England on the well-known heights of Lisbon;

* See "Hansard's Parliamentary Debates," June 2nd, 1828.

where that standard is planted foreign dominion shall not come." And twenty years later, Palmerston indulged in a no less boastful strain, when defending his policy in his great speech on the affairs of Greece. This talking to "Buncombe" was more popular formerly than it is now.

Another peculiarity of Mr. Canning's—that of employing jokes in Parliamentary debates—Lord Palmerston preserved to the end of his life. Without the keen and polished wit of Canning, he yet possessed no small talent for turning an opponent into ridicule, or jocosely putting aside a troublesome question.

The East Retford disfranchisement question was really the starting-point of Palmerston's public career in politics. Only three years before it had been rumoured that his re-election for Cambridge was so doubtful that he was expected to withdraw from it into the Upper House. As a member of the House of Peers he would probably have subsided into a personage of second-rate importance, and the world would have lost whatever there is to be learned from his history as Foreign Secretary and Prime Minister. Reviewing the early portion of his career, we see that a vigorous physical constitution was not broken in upon by excessive attention to public business and anxious cares of state for the first forty years of his life. We find him in the prime of manhood, when he begins the real struggles of ambition, with long official experience (slowly and unlaboriously acquired) to assist him; and we conclude that this slowly-developed ambition, this tardy aspiration after fame and power, was kindled into life and enthusiasm by his sympathy for a brilliant minister whose triumphs really seemed worth enjoying, since they cast so much *éclat* round the individual man. Provided with this key, we shall now attempt to trace briefly the better known portion of Lord Palmerston's life, beginning with the accession of William IV. to the throne of England.

In Canning's lifetime the oratorical and debating powers of his colleague had lain dormant. The Prime Minister once even spoke with regret of the loss he sustained through the silence of his Secretary at War. "What would I give," he exclaimed, when wearied with assaults from the Opposition benches—"what would I give to get that three-decker, Palmerston, to bear down upon them!"

The most agitating public question at the time when Palmerston resigned his office was that of the relief of the Roman Catholic subjects of Great Britain from the civil disabilities which had so long weighed upon them. On this question Lord Palmerston and other followers of Canning took the Liberal side, and distinguished themselves by the ability with which they supported their views in debate. One of Palmerston's very best speeches was that which he delivered on the 18th of March, 1829, on the Catholic Relief Bill. It is terse and business-like, yet elegant and lively. He ridicules the fears of those who dreaded the admission of some forty or fifty Catholic gentlemen within the walls of Parliament as being calculated to overthrow the constitution of a Protestant country. As for granting political power to the Catholics, he shows that they were already exercising very great power by their meetings and agitation—a power much more mischievous than would be their legitimate influence in the House of Commons. He boldly asserts that the question was not a religious one, but a political and an Irish question. Justice and humanity to Ireland demanded that the bill should pass—sound policy also required it, for civil war would probably result from the defeat of the bill. To those who derided the notion of Ireland resisting the English power, he said:

> "It is well for the gentlemen of England, who live secure under the protecting shadow of the law, whose slumbers have never been broken by the clashing of angry swords, whose harvests have never been trodden down by the conflict of hostile feet,—it is well for them to talk of civil war as if it were holiday pastime or some sport of children—
>
> 'They jest at scars who never felt a wound;'
>
> but that gentlemen who *have* seen with their own eyes, and heard with their own ears, the miseries which civil war produces, and should look upon it as anything but the last and greatest of national calamities, is to me a matter of the deepest and most unmixed astonishment."

Certainly, the man who could with dignity and spirit deliver language like this before a hostile phalanx of prejudiced Englishmen, was fitted to run the race of ambition with most of the men who then figured in the British Parliament.

As our readers well know, the opinions held by Lord Palmerston on the Catholic question triumphed. Wellington and Peel, after an obstinate resistance, conceded the claims set up in the Relief Bill. Palmerston saw that a strong tide of Liberalism was setting in, and, bidding farewell to the Tory ranks, he cast in his lot with the promoters of the next great movement—Parliamentary Reform. The heavings of the Reform agitation overthrew the tottering Wellington Ministry, and greatly influenced the political opinions of a new sovereign. On June 26th, 1830, George IV. died, and was succeeded on the throne by his sailor brother, the Duke of Clarence, who took the name of King William IV. Death, though a cruel enemy when he smites our friends, does generally flatter the survivors of men in high places with the hope that the vacancy left may advance them a step farther on the ladder which ambition climbs. In this respect Lord Palmerston was fortunate. Canning was cut off when he had hardly passed the prime of life. Three years later Huskisson was killed; and at a still later period men like Lord Durham, Lord Melbourne, and Sir Robert Peel, who occupied the public attention, or were favoured with the royal regard to the exclusion of their competitors, passed prematurely into the grave. So, likewise, Brougham, the most popular man of his time, was entrapped early into the House of Lords; and the only remaining rival of early days, Lord Russell—fairly beaten in the contest for power—stood for the last years of Palmerston's life second

on the list. Wellington and Peel continued in office until the month of November, 1830, when they retired before the manifest feeling of the country in favour of the Whigs. The latter, under the Premiership of Earl Grey, took possession of the Treasury bench, upon which they had gazed from the cold and barren seats of the Opposition for the long period of twenty-four years.

Together with other Canningites, Lord Palmerston entered the Cabinet and assumed the character by which he became best known in Europe when he accepted the office of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. His fitness for this office had not been exhibited in any very marked manner. At the outset of his career, indeed, in 1808, when a new-fledged Lord of the Admiralty, he had made a good speech in defence of the expedition to Copenhagen, treating that attack on a neutral as a matter of necessity, indispensable to the thwarting of Napoleon's policy of confederating maritime states against England. Again, in 1829, on the subject of Portugal, Palmerston had made a resolute effort to get into the front rank of statesmen, by a speech in which Mr. Canning's ideas on foreign policy were very ably set forth and adopted.

Our readers will remember that the third decade of the present century was a period of reaction in Europe against the liberal ideas that had prevailed to a certain extent even on thrones, when the first Napoleon fell. In 1815, Constitutionalism was rather in fashion. Louis XVIII. entered France with *la Charte*—the King of Prussia promised liberty and a constitution to his subjects as a reward for their patriotic struggle against Napoleon. Other German princes seemed willing to make concessions, and even sovereigns of greater note felt no dislike to theories which Castlereagh and Wellington patronised. In truth a constitutional form of government was thought to be a very innocent and harmless piece of machinery. Ten years' experience, however, of its active, stirring nature, and of the fruits it bore —free thought and a free press—tended to disabuse the ruling powers in Europe of their tenderness to Constitutionalism. The Holy Alliance was formed, and a system of repression was begun, with so much vigour and success that the English ministry, with Wellington at their head, believed that Conservatism in its strongest form of development, that of Absolutism, was about to commence a long reign in Europe.

In accordance with this belief, the foreign policy of Wellington acquired a very Conservative colour. In the struggle in Portugal between Don Miguel and Don Pedro, the Absolutist prince enjoyed the countenance of the English Government, which also, in the affairs of Greece, supported the reactionary views of Russia. For this conduct the Ministers were called to account in the House of Commons on the 1st June, 1829, by Sir James Mackintosh, who charged them with disregarding the neutrality of England by favouring Don Miguel, and not giving fair play to Don Pedro and his partisans. Peel replied to Mackintosh, and was supported by Huskisson, who attempted to identify the policy of the government with that of Canning. Thereupon rose Lord Palmerston, and in a speech of great fervour and eloquence gave to Canning's views on foreign policy an interpretation widely differing from that offered by Huskisson. He frankly avowed his opinions in favour of interference in the affairs of foreign countries, as long as such interference was only a moral one, and did not require the employment of force:

"There are two great parties in Europe," he said, "one, which endeavours to bear sway by the force of public opinion; another, which endeavours to bear sway by the force of physical control. The principle on which the system of the last-named party is founded is, in my view, fundamentally erroneous. There is in nature no moving power but mind—all else is passive and inert; in human affairs this power is opinion; in political affairs it is public opinion; and he who can grasp the power, with it will subdue the fleshly arm of physical strength, and compel it to work out his purpose."

After giving a fine illustration of his meaning, from the person of the steersman who directs the majestic ship where he will over the vast deeps of ocean, making nature obey the powers of mind, he goes on to say:

"And those statesmen who know how to avail themselves of the passions, and the interests, and the opinions of mankind, are able to gain an ascendancy and to exercise a sway over human affairs, far out of all proportion greater than belong to the power and resources of the State over which they preside."

In this speech he showed pretty clearly what he conceived a British Minister of Foreign Affairs ought to be, and what he should be if ever he obtained that office. A year had scarcely elapsed, when he received from Earl Grey the invitation to become the Foreign Secretary of State.

In our judgment of Lord Palmerston's conduct with respect to the general politics of Europe, we must confess at once that we do not share the opinions of either of those extreme sections of politicians who have denounced him as an enemy of the human race. While the sovereigns of Austria and Naples and ministers of the Metternich school laid the burden of their wrongs on Palmerston's shoulders, the Republicans and patriots of Europe, regarding him as the frustrator of their projects, shouted at the top of their voices, "Hat der Teufel einen Sohn, so ist er, sicher, Palmerston." We believe in the truth neither of these charges nor of Mr. Urquhart's accusation that Lord Palmerston was bribed by Russia to sell the interests of his native country. Our conviction is, that personally and individually Lord Palmerston had no special political creed. Having become master in the art of managing numbers of men, by courting popularity on the one hand, and judiciously opposing certain persons on the other, he found enough to satisfy his ambition in the active exercise of power. He found also that he could do this as easily with a Parliament and a free Press as other men could do it by the exercise of autocratic

power. Having no decided political principles of his own, he took care to watch the current of public opinion, and by an instinct which belongs to all minds given to practical observation, he knew when to launch himself upon the current, and when to withdraw from its eddies. When Talleyrand said of Palmerston, "C'est un homme qui n'a pas le talent du raisonnement," he forgot, or seemed to forget, that in England the politics of men in office are reasoned out for them, that however much they may aspire to *lead* the mind of the country, they do in fact only *follow* its dictates. A Minister in England has no more the power of forcing measures for which the country is not prepared, than he has of resisting changes which an enlightened majority demand. This is a commonplace that is sometimes denied by disappointed agitators, but is true, nevertheless.

Some exception to the theory may doubtless be made with regard to foreign politics, which the English public, until quite recently, have been content to ignore. Of this circumstance Lord Palmerston, during his long occupancy of the Foreign Office, did not fail to take advantage. He carried on his diplomacy with as much secrecy as the minister of a German potentate. When he needed popular support to make some particular negotiation bear with peculiar force upon a foreign Government, he contrived to make known so much of a given incident as would wound the national susceptibilities and excite popular animosity against the Government upon which he desired to operate. For this purpose he availed himself of the assistance of the Press more generally, and with better effect than many modern politicians. The history of the noble Viscount's opinions on the subject of Russia illustrates his principle of adopting the general feeling of the day as his own. In his great speech on foreign affairs, June 1st, 1829, he observes, when speaking of the war in the East, that—

> "Turkey was the aggressor, and Russia had a right to compensation for injury sustained, and that a regard for the interests of Europe and a regard for the interests of Turkey herself, ought equally to impel France and England to urge the Sultan to make fair terms as soon as he could," for "that the people of England would be little disposed to pay subsidies to Austria for the recovery of unpronounceable fortresses on the Danube after they had been lost by the obstinate perverseness of Turkey."

This language admirably expressed the general feeling of the British public on the subject. There was then no hostile feeling to Russia among Englishmen, and little dread of her growing power in Turkey, a country for which but faint sympathy was felt. Eight year later, however, when the Treaty of Adrianople had excited in Britain jealousy of Russian progress in the East, Lord Palmerston was called to account by Mr. Roebuck for not resenting the capture, by a Russian ship-of-war, of the *Vixen*, a merchant vessel, seized for breaking the blockade of the Circassian coast. The Foreign Secretary pronounced a lukewarm defence of Russia, and maintained her right to seize a vessel breaking the blockade, yet he condemned "the extension of the Russian frontier on the mouth of the Danube, to the south of the Caucasus and the shores of the Black Sea." Here, chiming in with public opinion, he seemed unwilling to affront Russia, while he showed due deference to British pride. Again, in the differences that arose between the two Governments in 1853–4, there is no reason to believe that Palmerston was unfavourable to accommodation with Russia. He was certainly a member of Lord Aberdeen's pacific Ministry. When, however, the national jealousy of Russian aggrandizement was raised to fever-heat, Palmerston took up the cry, and sailed on the gales of popularity thus acquired into the post of Premier.

So much by way of illustration of his political system, such as it was. We return to the history of his public acts from the time of his entering the Foreign Office as one of Lord Grey's Reform Cabinet. The distinctive principles of the new Ministry were expressed in the popular formula, "reform, retrenchment, and peace."

Those who thought that "peace" meant "non-interference" in foreign affairs, had soon reason to be disappointed in the new Secretary of State. The French Revolution of July, 1830, and its consequences, had been promptly accepted by Lord Aberdeen and the Duke of Wellington's Cabinet. The same policy was adopted by the succeeding Ministry. France represented the liberal triumph over Absolutism as a *fait accompli*, and her revolutionary government was acknowledged and lauded. When, however, the insurrection of the Poles in the same year seemed to demand, as a logical consequence of Liberal principles, both countenance and aid, England and France held back, and Western diplomacy was silent. To plot against an established Government, to meddle in questions which might be called, diplomatically, questions of internal administration, was a very different thing from ratifying the decision of a people who overturned one ruler to set up another. Russia, too, was strong and great in resources, having an army with considerable *prestige*, and was allied in a common cause with Prussia and Austria. Though it is not romantic to abandon a cause because it is hopeless, it is very practical, and where a man is as a Minister handling matters that touch the welfare of millions of his fellow-countrymen, every consideration binds him to a practical line of conduct. In return for the non-interference of the Western Powers in the internal affairs of Russia, the three military potentates were compelled reluctantly to forego the pleasure of interfering in the question of Belgium and Holland. The annexation by the Congress at Vienna of the Belgian Provinces to Holland, as a fence against French ambition, had proved a failure. The newly-united provinces did not amalgamate with the old, differing from them as they did in religion and in their notions of good government. Dutch rule became odious to the mass of the Belgians, who revolted against Holland soon after the accession of Louis Philippe. In a brief space of time the Dutch troops were driven out of

all the Belgian towns except the citadel of Antwerp. Here was an opportunity for the application of Lord Palmerston's theory of "moral intervention." A new power had to be erected in Europe, the Government of which should be at once acceptable to the people governed and to the powerful neighbours who were looking on with gloomy jealousy. The task was difficult, as being so glaring an infringement on the part of Liberal Governments of the Treaties of 1815. It was Palmerston's first attempt at the higher kind of statesmanship, and it must be admitted that he won his spurs. With great tact, courage, and decisiveness, he conducted intricate negotiations on the subject with the powers interested. He kept before him two leading ideas—1st. That Belgium should have a constitutional Government. 2nd. That the interests of England should not suffer. He held the Northern Powers at bay, by showing them that England and France were perfectly agreed upon one point—namely, that Belgium should be independent, spite of the Congress of Vienna. He baffled the intrigues which were rife both in France and Belgium for annexing the latter country to the former; he helped to defeat the attempts made to establish a Belgian Republic; and finally he contrived that Prince Leopold, the widowed husband of the late heiress to the British throne, should be elected King of the new constitutional kingdom, France giving the Queen. It cannot be denied that the little kingdom has been prosperous during its thirty odd years of existence, and that it passed through a trying crisis in European history with safety and honour. Let Lord Palmerston, therefore, have credit for his share in the creation of the Belgian kingdom.

A more difficult question soon arose to tax the energies and ingenuity of the English Minister's eager mind. A crisis occurred almost simultaneously in the affairs of the two kingdoms of the Western Peninsula—Spain and Portugal. It is perhaps generally forgotten now, that after the Empire of Brazil had been separated from the kingdom of Portugal (1822), Don Pedro, on the death of his father in 1826, retained the American crown for himself, and nominated his daughter Donna Maria to the throne of Portugal, with the proviso that she should marry her uncle Don Miguel, the heir-presumptive and Pedro's brother. To this arrangement Don Miguel objected, and repudiating the proposed marriage, placed himself at the head of the reactionary party in the country, overthrew the constitution which his brother had granted by charter, and usurped the throne. His government was tyrannical, and acts of violence committed against foreign subjects drew upon him the armed interference of France, Great Britain, and the United States. Meanwhile, Pedro had been compelled to abdicate his Brazilian throne, and was watching events in Portugal from Terceira, one of the Azore islands. In 1832 he made an unsuccessful descent upon the kingdom, and in the following year, his fleet, commanded by the English Commodore Charles Napier, annihilated Don Miguel's fleet near Cape St. Vincent. This triumph was followed by Pedro's occupation of Lisbon, and the proclamation of a constitution with Donna Maria as Queen. The new Government was at once acknowledged by France and England.

Throughout the whole of these transactions, Lord Palmerston had given his moral support to the Constitutionalists, but he did not interfere in the dispute by physical force. In the affairs of Spain he was not altogether so prudent. We must hastily recapitulate the circumstances which brought on civil war in that ancient monarchy. Ever since the accession of the Bourbons to the Spanish throne, it had been the law that no Queen could reign in the country. This was expressly provided in the Treaty of Utrecht, in order to prevent the possibility of Spain becoming by marriage an appanage to the French crown. King Ferdinand, however, having to provide for his two children, who were daughters, did violence to his Absolutist feelings, and bribed the Cortes, with a constitution, to alter the fundamental law of the country, and to decree the lawfulness of a Queen's sovereignty. By this decree, Ferdinand's brother, Don Carlos, was deprived of the inheritance to the crown. When Ferdinand died, Carlos asserted his right to be King, and naturally, though very unwisely, threw himself upon the party of Anti-Constitutionalists for support. The friends of freedom rallied round the young Queen Isabella, in whose name the Government was administered by her mother. A long and bloody war ensued. The Constitutionalists received from Lord Palmerston as much support as he dared to give. The Cabinet of which he formed a part was not very firmly seated. The cause of Don Carlos had numerous friends in England, where, even without a thought of future "Spanish marriages," it was considered that the principles involved in the Treaty of Utrecht ought not to have been abandoned. Besides this, the formidable power of the northern nations was in favour of Don Carlos, and bitterly hostile to Palmerston's policy. He met their threatened intervention by the famous quadruple treaty between England, France, Spain, and Portugal, by which each of the contracting parties engaged to defend the existing monarchies in the Peninsula against all attempts to displace them. The parties interested were left to fight out their domestic quarrels free from interference. In England, however, permission was given to certain volunteers forming a Spanish legion to take service under Queen Isabella. Lord Palmerston even succeeded in persuading his colleagues to have a British squadron stationed off the north coast of Spain, with instructions to aid the Queen's troops and annoy those of Don Carlos. For this departure from his principle of purely moral intervention, he was severely handled in Parliament, especially by Lord Aberdeen, who condemned the whole tenor of the Whig policy, and insisted that non-interference meant neutrality. In the Press, too, he was accused of "buccaneering," and of leading the country into disgrace on the coast of Spain. But in the end he enjoyed the triumph of seeing Constitutionalism established in Spain as well as in Portugal, and of knowing that the moral support of England had greatly contributed to that result.

Once again he interfered in the affairs of Portugal, when Queen Maria, yielding to the influence of the Reactionists, provoked her people to rebellion, and appealed to Spain for the fulfilment of the Quadruple Treaty. Lord Palmerston offered to mediate between the Queen and her subjects, and when the latter, declining his proposals, marched towards Lisbon to expel their sovereign, the British fleet lying in the Tagus was instructed to intercept the insurgents, and the rebellion was at once put down. This interference did not take place until the Queen had engaged to restore the constitution to its full vigour, in accordance with the charter. The marvel of this portion of the late Premier's history lies in the circumstance that while he was thus behaving abroad with the energy, promptitude, and decision of a powerful Minister, the Cabinet of which he was a member exhibited the greatest weakness and vacillation in their domestic policy, and were barely supported in the House of Commons by a majority of twenty or thirty votes. But the audacity and vigour of the Foreign Secretary were none the less exerted in the Syrian question, which soon engaged the attention of the leading Governments of Europe. Lord Palmerston's difficulties were increased enormously in these transactions, by having to work against not only the skilful diplomacy of Russia, but also against the ill-concealed opposition of the French Government. The Pasha of Egypt had invaded Syria with a view to annexing that country to his own. The interests of England and Austria required the preservation of the Ottoman Empire in its integrity. Russia naturally expected to profit by the dissolution of its ancient enemy, while France, recurring to the policy of the first Napoleon, sought to acquire influence in the East through the instrumentality of Egypt and Syria.

Palmerston laboured hard to bring about an alliance with France, Prussia, and Austria, for the defence of Turkey, but M. Thiers, who was then Minister to Louis Philippe, interposed objections and delays, in order to give time to Ibrahim Pasha to consolidate his power in Syria. No time was to be lost, and with or without the consent of France, Palmerston was determined to have the Egyptians turned out of Syria. To the astonishment of France and the other Powers, a treaty was suddenly signed in 1840 between England, Austria, and Turkey, for the defence of the Ottoman Porte, and a fleet was instantly despatched to the coast of Syria, with instructions to drive the Egyptians out of the country. These instructions were promptly and efficiently carried out. Great was the fury and indignation of the French at being thus cleverly over-reached in diplomacy, and left out of the treaty. Thiers might have roused the whole nation into a war in defence of Mehemet Ali but for the decidedly pacific policy which Louis Philippe had resolved to pursue. The feeling of annoyance in France gradually subsided after being gratified with an outrage committed upon the British consul at Tahiti in the Pacific Ocean.

We may here very properly refer to Lord Palmerston's exertions in putting down the nefarious traffic in slaves from Africa. It was in 1840 that a decisive blow was dealt at the Portuguese dealers in human flesh, by the destruction of the barracoons erected on the African coast as entrepôts for the safe custody of captured negroes brought from the interior to market. Captain Denman, by Lord Palmerston's directions, made a treaty with the chief of the region in which these barracks were most numerous, and having thus acquired a legal authorization to destroy them, he liberated the wretched creatures confined there, and burned down the buildings. It is a noteworthy circumstance that the Portuguese owners of the barracoons brought an action against Captain Denman in the English Court of Queen's Bench for injury done to their property; but neither law nor justice was on their side, and they lost the cause. Further discouragement was given to the slave-trade by strengthening the cruising squadron on the coast of Africa, and by placing a similar fleet of cruisers to watch the Brazilian coast where the slaves were most generally sold. The slave-dealing King of Ashantee was also punished by the capture of the city of Lagos. In consequence of these and other vigorous measures, the dealing in blacks became unprofitable, and Lord Palmerston earned the praise of having given a severe blow to the slave-trade.

In 1841, the Whigs quitted office and remained on the Opposition benches for about five years, during which Sir Robert Peel prepared, matured, and carried his great measures of tariff—Reform and Free Trade.

Lord Palmerston was not idle meanwhile; he watched the Conservative Ministers with a keen eye, and indulged in smart attacks upon what seemed to be their apathy in the conduct of public affairs, during the gestation of the great changes they contemplated. The marriage of Lord John Russell at this juncture, and his consequent absence from Parliament, placed Palmerston in the position of leader of the Whig party in the House of Commons, an opportunity which the noble Viscount did not fail to improve, and Lord Russell may probably date from the period of that luckless holiday the loss of influence which enabled Palmerston to supersede him. On the conduct of foreign affairs by Lord Aberdeen at this time, Palmerston expressed his opinions in an able speech, censuring the treaty which Lord Ashburton had concluded with the United States regulating the possessions of the north-eastern boundary and the State of Maine. He derisively called it the "Ashburton Capitulation," and intimated that the Minister had yielded to the Americans more than was required by honour. The House, however, was too sensible to re-open a question that might have led to complications, and the ex-Foreign Secretary's motion of censure was not even put to the vote.

Indeed, distrust of the Palmerstonian foreign policy had very much increased even among the Whigs, and at the very critical moment of repealing the obnoxious Corn Laws, 1845-6, Lord John Russell was prevented from forming a Ministry, by the refusal of Earl Grey to sit in the Cabinet if Palmerston were made Foreign

Secretary. Thus the Whigs were deprived of that which was their due—the glory of establishing Free Trade.

On the resignation of Peel, after carrying his great measures, Lord Russell became Prime Minister, and Palmerston once more Foreign Secretary, and they both remained in office for nearly six years (1846–52). Reasons for British intervention in the affairs of other countries soon arose. The cantons of Switzerland were divided among themselves on the subject of religion and the intrusion of the Jesuits. Civil war began, and the Continental Powers were about to interfere on behalf of the Catholics, when Lord Palmerston insisted upon a conference of all the Powers to settle the terms of a general intervention. He, meanwhile, counselled the Government of the Confederation to act promptly with the Catholic cantons, and subdue them by force of arms; this was done, and all further intervention of the Great Powers was at once obviated. In 1847–8, the British Government was threatened with a more serious complication on the question of the Spanish marriages. The provision made by the Treaty of Utrecht, to prevent the union of France and Spain under one crown, having been, as we have said above, abrogated by the Treaty of the Quadruple Alliance, Lord Palmerston kept a vigilant diplomatic eye upon King Louis Philippe, who made great efforts to strengthen the position of his family by matrimonial alliances. The French King would not consent to forego all connexion by marriage with the Spanish Bourbons, but he gave up the claim of his family to the hand of the Queen of Spain, and agreed that his son should not marry her sister until an heir or heiress to the throne of Spain should be born. As soon, however, as Isabella had espoused her cousin, her sister was married to the Duc de Montpensier, and the indignation of Lord Palmerston was justly aroused at the flagrant breach of faith. An angry correspondence ensued between the English and French Cabinets and had not concluded when Louis Philippe was precipitated from his throne by a revolution, which communicated itself as by an electric shock to nearly all the kingdoms of Europe. Some people have been found on the continent ignorant and unthinking enough to attribute these fearful convulsions to the machinations of Lord Palmerston. They can know little of the nature of political transactions, or of the mode of forming and directing public opinion, who suppose such a mighty influence to be within the grasp of a Minister in England, watched as he is by six hundred keen-eyed members of the House of Commons, and a House of Peers jealous of every encroachment on prerogative. It is certain that Lord Palmerston never loved Republicans or their doctrines. An illustration of his antipathy is to be found in the fate which befel the unhappy Sicilians, when abandoned to the mercies of Ferdinand of Naples. After the great war with the first Napoleon, the British Government had promised that the constitutional forms of government in Sicily should be preserved and respected. The promise made was not kept, and the islanders, in 1848, rose against the Neapolitan Government, and asserted their independence. Palmerston was ready with his moral aid, and promised to reorganise their independence if they could erect themselves into a monarchy under one of the princes of the House of Savoy. To this plan of independence the Republican party in Italy and the Radical party in England were both violently opposed; and Palmerston, finding himself thwarted in his schemes, left the Sicilians to their fate, and they fell immediately under the despotism of the bombarding King Ferdinand. The very scheme of placing a Sardinian prince on the throne of Sicily, with a liberal constitution, has since been fully carried out in the person of Victor Emmanuel.

Lord Palmerston suffered another check from the spirit of reaction guided by a Bourbon. Isabella of Spain, under the influence of certain men favourable to despotism, was striving earnestly to destroy the representative system in her country. When Europe was heaving with revolutions, the English Foreign Secretary thought it his duty to warn the Spanish Government of the danger they were running into, and to remonstrate against their proceedings. This interference on the part of the "barbarian islanders" was promptly resented, and the British Ambassador, Sir Henry Bulwer, was dismissed from Madrid. The only reply to this indignity was the *congé* of the Spanish Ambassador from London, and diplomatic intercourse between the two courts ceased, until a reconciliation was brought about by the announcement of the birth of a Spanish princess. The greatest trial, however, to which Lord Palmerston's policy was ever exposed, arose out of the miserably paltry question of compensation due from the Greek Government at Athens to certain individuals under the protection of the British flag, for outrages committed upon them by the Greek populace. One whose name was most frequently repeated in the debates that ensued was a Jew, named Pacifico, a native of one of the Ionian Islands, who greatly exaggerated the amount of compensation due to him. The Greek Government, however, having refused to entertain the question at all, the whole of Pacifico's demand was claimed by Palmerston, who insisted upon having the principle, at least, admitted that British subjects were entitled to reparation in circumstances like those alleged. At the time negotiations were pending on this subject, an insurrection broke out in the Ionian Islands, the instigators of which were suspected, but could not be proceeded against for want of proof.

The avowed object of the insurrection, however, being union with Greece, Lord Palmerston turned the Pacifico claim into an instrument for punishing the Government at Athens. He demanded immediate satisfaction of the Jew's claim, and cut short all delays and subterfuges by causing the British admiral to seize Greek merchant-ships to double the value of the amount claimed. A great commotion in all the courts of Europe was the consequence. The mediation of France was accepted so far as the amount of reparation due was concerned, but no liberty was left to the mediator to question

the justice of the original claim. On that subject England would admit of no mediation, being resolute in her determination to support the claims. The French agent, however, did precisely what he was not asked to do; he examined the question of the justice of any claim at all. The Greek Government recovered their courage and began to trifle with England. Immediate orders were sent from London to continue the seizure of Greek merchant-ships till all claims were paid. Otho's ministers were humbled once more, and the French agent went back to Paris disgusted. His Government, that of the Republic, felt themselves insulted and withdrew their ambassador from London—a degree of susceptibility which doubtless augmented Lord Palmerston's dislike to Republicanism. The affair was at length arranged; the French Ambassador returned to England in a few days, the justice of the English claims on Greece was admitted, and the mediation of France was again accepted for settling the amount due to the outraged persons. The question was not, however, thus finally set at rest. Two great Parliamentary battles ensued—one in each House of Parliament.

The Earl of Derby, in an eloquent speech, replete with that stinging satire which he wields with so much effect, moved in the House of Lords a vote of censure on the foreign policy of the Government. The aged Marquis of Lansdowne, in defending Lord Palmerston, opened his speech by remarking that, in the House of Commons, where his noble friend sat and could defend himself, none of his opponents dared to bring forward a motion of censure. This would seem to have been very near to the truth of the matter, for although the Ministry were condemned by a majority in the Upper House, the Opposition in the Lower House abstained from trying the question. The public, unaccustomed to see a Ministry retaining office after an adverse vote in Parliament, were in some perplexity until Mr. Roebuck, a supporter of the Government and of Lord Palmerston, put a question to the Premier (Lord Russell) in the House of Commons as to what the Ministers intended to do in consequence of the resolution in the House of Lords. In reply, Lord Russell said that he did not propose to do anything in consequence of that vote. He justified his disregard of the Peers' resolution, according to his wont, by several excellent examples from the history of the Constitution, and after noticing the terms of that resolution, which "recognised the right and duty of the Government to secure to her Majesty's subjects residing in foreign States the full protection of the laws of those States," he intimated that it was the right and duty of an English Government to protect English subjects to the very best of their power, according to their own conception of the laws and justice to which an Englishman feels himself entitled. If the subjects of other governments do not enjoy a similar measure of law and justice, an Englishman may regret their position and may wish them better fortune, but his Government is not to refuse him protection against unjust laws because they exist in a foreign State. In conclusion, he said—

"So long as we continue the government of this country I can answer for my noble friend that he will act, not as the Minister of Austria, or as the Minister of Russia, or of France, or of any other country, but as the Minister of England. The honour of England and the interests of England are matters within our keeping, and to those interests and to that honour our conduct in future will be, as hitherto it has been, devoted."

There is no little pride and defiance in these words, uttered as they were in the face of Europe, ever attentive to the proceedings of the British Parliament.

Mr. Disraeli, the chief of the Opposition in the House of Commons, though he replied to the taunts of Lord Russell, did not propose a vote of censure, and Mr. Roebuck, in order to bring the subject into a satisfactory constitutional state, and test the opinions of the representative House, proposed a vote of confidence and approbation in favour of the Minister's foreign policy. A tremendous debate ensued, lasting four nights, and bringing into full play the oratorical abilities of the leading men on both sides. Lord Palmerston, on the second evening, made a speech of five hours' duration, which was not only the most remarkable speech in the debate, but the best specimen of Parliamentary eloquence that he ever pronounced. He gave a very complete history of the relations of England with Greece; he retorted upon Lord Derby in many happy hits, condemned his manner of describing Pacifico as a poor contemptible Jew—

"As if a man, because he was poor, might be bastinadoed and tortured with impunity;" or, "because a man is of the Jewish persuasion he is fair game for any outrage. It is a true saying," he continued, "and one that has often been repeated, that a very moderate share of human wisdom is sufficient for the guidance of human affairs.

"But there is another truth equally indisputable, which is, that a man who aspires to govern mankind ought to bring to the task generous sentiments, compassionate sympathies, and noble and elevated thoughts."

This was evidently a dart aimed at "Scorpion Stanley." Again, speaking of the two Ionians who were arrested, manacled and thumb-screwed, he observed—

"Then it was said that the application of the thumb-screw had not maimed them for life. Had that indeed been the case, the men would have been entitled to compensation, but for a very little thumb-screwing applied only during an evening walk no compensation ought to have been required. I am of a different opinion. Thumb-screws are not as easy to wear as gloves, which can be put on and pulled off at pleasure."

Strokes of humour of this kind, uttered in a genial, pleasant manner, had the very best effect upon his auditors. He reviewed all the transactions which had occurred during his twenty years' tenure of the Foreign Office seals, and concluded with his famous declaration:—

"As the Roman in days of old held himself free from indignity when he could say *Civis Romanus sum*, so also a British subject, in whatever land he may be, shall feel confident that the watchful eye

and the strong arm of England will protect him against injustice and wrong."

The debate was rendered all the more memorable as being the last occasion on which Sir Robert Peel addressed the House of Commons. He spoke with his usual ability and sobriety, and while he paid homage to the talents of Palmerston, using the remarkable words, "his most able and most temperate speech made us proud of the man who delivered it," he yet condemned the policy which made diplomacy a means of disturbing and irritating foreign nations:—

"It is," he said, "a costly engine for maintaining peace—an instrument used by civilized nations for preventing war—if your application of it be to fester every wound, to provoke instead of to soothe resentments, to continue an angry correspondence for the purpose of promoting what is supposed to be an English interest, to keep up conflicts with the representatives of other powers,—then I say, not only is the expenditure on this costly instrument thrown away, but the great engine used by civilized society for the purpose of maintaining peace is perverted into a cause of hostility and war."

These words expressed the opinions which a large body of Englishmen entertained of the Palmerston policy. But it ought in justice to be remembered that men of this kind concentrated their thoughts upon domestic policy, insulated England from the other nations of the world, and regarded foreign affairs with supreme indifference. Whatever may be Lord Palmerston's faults, he has done much to shake the English nation out of this apathetic disregard of foreigners. If his efforts at the propagandism of constitutional theories have made for him many enemies abroad, they have at the same time tended to destroy the insularity of Englishmen, and to make them more cosmopolitan in their sympathies. The final result of the debate was a complete triumph for Palmerston and the Ministry to which he belonged. In an unusually full House of 574 members, they had a majority of 46. The hero of the day was fêted and applauded in all parts of the country, and his extraordinary popularity as a minister dates from that time. In this state of public feeling, Lord Russell, by an act perfectly justifiable in itself, yet singularly wanting in political tact, threw his old colleague out of office and almost into the arms of the Opposition. The occasion of this schism in the English Cabinet was the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon in December, 1851. The day after that important event, December 3rd, Count Walewski, the French ambassador in London, had a long conversation with Lord Palmerston, during which the latter expressed his satisfaction at the course taken by the President of the Republic for the repression of socialism and anarchy. On the same day the English ambassador at Paris wrote home for instructions to guide his conduct under the new order of things. Lord Russell immediately called a Cabinet Council, at which it was resolved to instruct the Minister at Paris to continue with the new Government on the same footing that he had held with the old, without interfering at all in questions that belonged to the internal administration of France. The Marquis of Normanby communicated these instructions to the French Minister, and made apologies for delaying to give this assurance of the continued friendship of Great Britain. Monsieur Turgot replied that the delay imported little, because he had already received from Walewski, two days previously, an assurance of Lord Palmerston's hearty approval of what the President had done. This statement struck Lord Normanby with surprise, and wounded his vanity. He wrote to the Foreign Office for an explanation and immediately received an answer to the effect that "Lord Palmerston did prefer unity and order in France to anarchy, and that it would be better for English interests to have it so."

Meanwhile a similar demand for explanation had reached the Foreign Office from the Palace, being transmitted to Palmerston by the Prime Minister, Russell. This demand Palmerston was in no haste to answer, for reasons which may partly be guessed. The Premier, therefore, quitting the subject of the unauthorized approval of the *coup d'état*, objected to the letter of explanation which had been sent to Lord Normanby without the knowledge or sanction of the Cabinet, and intimated that the seals of the Foreign Office must be resigned—and resigned they were. The triumph over Palmerston was but brief. His popularity increased rapidly. He had been considered the most able man in the Ministry, which could not long survive his resignation. Mr. Roebuck pointedly said—

"At this critical period the most marked person in the Administration—he, around whom all the party battles of the Administration had been fought—whose political existence had been made the political existence of the Government itself—the person on whose being in office the Government rested their existence as a Government, was dismissed; their right hand was cut off, their most powerful arm was taken away, and at the critical time when it was most needed."

Similar language was used by other Liberal members of the House of Commons. It was not long before the dismissed Minister took his revenge on his late colleagues. He had quitted office in December, 1851. On the 3rd February following Parliament assembled, and on the 20th of the same month the Ministers, being left in a minority of eleven on an amendment moved by Lord Palmerston, resigned. The question was the introduction by Lord Russell of "A Bill to Amend the Laws respecting the Local Militia." Lord Palmerston professed his belief that a local militia was nearly useless, and that a general militia, which might move to any part of the country, was the thing wanted. He proposed, therefore, that the word "local" should be omitted from the title of the bill, and his proposition was carried. Thereupon the Prime Minister said, "that, as the Ministers no longer possessed the confidence of the House, the usual course would be followed." So much for the word "local," upon which was made to hang the fate of a Government. The word in this instance represented public confidence in the fitness of Ministers for

their post. Palmerston for the nonce gained nothing by his victory beyond the triumph over Lord Russell. Lord Derby, Disraeli, and party, constituted the new Ministry, into which they tried in vain to tempt Palmerston. He remained out of office, biding his time, but supported the Conservative Government on two or three important occasions. The Ministry could not, however, stand more than a few months. Mr. Disraeli's financial plans were most severely handled by Mr. Gladstone; and Lord Derby, after an adverse division in the House of Commons, resigned. A new Ministry was formed of Liberals and Peelites, under the premiership of Palmerston's old political antagonist, Lord Aberdeen.

The abilities and influence of the ex-Secretary for Foreign Affairs were acknowledged by his appointment as Minister for Home Affairs. Neither Aberdeen nor Russell would consent to his being placed at the head of the Foreign Office. Lord Palmerston justified the appointment by the vigour and promptitude with which he performed his new duties. That famous and much-abused coalition Ministry was a combination of many eminent statesmen. Though absolute agreement among independent minds is not possible, there was sufficient affinity between these public men, and certainly sufficient ability, to enable them to carry on the Government efficiently. The tact and good feeling of the chief kept them well together during peace, but the approach of war was too severe a trial for the confederation of old enemies and new friends. With reviving jealousies and rivalries within, furious and unscrupulous factions without, and a terrible peril hanging over Europe, Lord Aberdeen's position became extremely painful. Though accused of pusillanimity, and caricatured as an "old woman," his conduct was throughout consistent. Convinced that war retards civilization, he strove to avert that calamity, but having at length accepted it as a dire necessity, he prosecuted it with all his might. For the disasters which befel the British army in the Crimea, Lord Aberdeen's war administration was not to blame. The system of the military authorities in London had long been defective. When history shall reveal the secrets of cabinets, it will be acknowledged that no man more vehemently than Aberdeen urged on the contest in which no man so reluctantly embarked. Despite his genuine merits, however, the anger of the nation at the course of events in the Crimea, expressed and increased by the press, was too great to be appeased by any sacrifice short of the resignation of the Ministers. The resignation of the Coalition Ministry, though promoted by the attacks of the Opposition, was not caused by their adverse vote so much as by the unmistakable expression of public opinion excited by the inquiry into the state of the army, which culminated in the vote of the House of Commons on Roebuck's motion. The consequence was, that the Opposition was not ready or willing to undertake the responsibilities of Government. Lord Russell was absent from England on his unlucky mission to Vienna and Berlin, where he had contrived to make matters worse than they were before; no leader of eminence but Palmerston was left to assume at once the chieftainship of the Liberals. He had, indeed, no following in Parliament like Russell, whose hundred friends voted for the man, not his measures. But Palmerston was strong in himself and in the opinion of the public. In the strength of his popularity he triumphantly entered the office of First Lord of the Treasury, spite of the opposition of the Conservative party, of the Peelites, and of many on the Liberal side, who had disapproved of his foreign policy. Bitter must have been the mortification in many hearts at this triumph, but the new Premier did not at first abuse his power. He was gay and bland to all, worked assiduously at the duties of his office, and made up his Ministry of hard-working men, rather than humble himself before the shining talents to obtain their adhesion. He allowed his most redoubtable colleague and rival, Lord Russell, to ruin himself in public estimation by diplomatic *gaucheries*. The new Prime Minister had hardly sat at his first Cabinet Council when the news reached London of the sudden death of the Emperor Nicholas. This event, however lamentable it may have been for those who loved the Czar, was a most fortunate one for Lord Palmerston, whose greatest difficulty was thus removed. He had been called to his high place by the popular voice for the very purpose of vigorously prosecuting the war with Russia. As everything had been done by the late Government that could be done, Palmerston would have been unable to satisfy the clamorous demands of the nation, for more victories and fewer disasters; the greatest boon therefore that fortune could send him at this juncture was the prospect of peace offered by the accession of the Czar Alexander II. The bond of personal friendship existing between the Emperor Louis Napoleon and Lord Palmerston was no doubt of great service to both. This intimacy, however, was too close to be long maintained without deranging the legitimate relations with their respective countries of the two persons concerned. At the close of the Crimean War, for instance, the French Emperor hurried forward the negotiations with Russia just when England, "the unready," had got herself into prime condition for continuing the war or for exacting hard conditions.

The friendship of the Emperor at a later period was otherwise injurious to Lord Palmerston. Meanwhile the ancient rival of the English Prime Minister was adroitly thrown out of office, in consequence of his accepting at Vienna terms of peace with Russia, which the Cabinet in London could not accept.

At length, on the 1st February, 1856, at noon, a protocol was signed at Vienna by the ministers of Russia, France, England, Austria, and Turkey, accepting the Austrian propositions as a basis of peace. A conference was opened at Paris on the 25th of the same month, at which the British Government was represented by Lord Clarendon. It required all Lord Clarendon's acuteness and steadiness of purpose to

gain by the pen what England had not gained by the sword. The Russian and French diplomatists were drawn together by a common desire to baffle English projects. In Lord Clarendon, however, Lord Palmerston had an able and friendly negotiator, who, in yielding some points of his chief's political programme, gained others. The story of these negotiations is too recent to require further enlargement from us at present. Without doubt, the plans were there first *ébauché* of the Italian war for independence and unity under Victor Emmanuel. The excessive friendliness, too, between the sovereigns of Western Europe, which had taken Louis Napoleon and his empress to London, and Queen Victoria and her consort to Paris, began to cool a little when it was found that the peace caused a *rapprochement* between the courts of France and Russia. When the difficulties arose about Bessarabia and the proper interpretation of the treaty of Paris, Lord Palmerston showed his determination to have the points of the treaty strictly adhered to. At a Lord Mayor's dinner, on the 10th of November, 1856, he explained his conduct by saying—

"We were convinced that the people of England would willingly forego the prospect of future military and naval glory when they were satisfied that the objects of the war had been substantially accomplished. It now remains that the conditions of the peace shall be faithfully executed and honourably observed; and I trust that the peace of Europe will be placed on a secure and permanent basis."

In this speech the Premier expressed the feelings of his influential mercantile auditory. On tact of this kind was Lord Palmerston's art of governing mainly based. He handled commonplaces with extreme skill, and persuaded his auditors that he was right by simply expressing the opinions which he knew to prevail among them. He did not alter his own views, conclusions, or anticipations. He was often but a mouthpiece, giving voice to the thoughts of his audience, which he generally had the sagacity to divine aright. For two years Palmerston's career as Premier was successful and prosperous. In February and March, 1857, it was exposed to rude trials in the famous debate on China. We give a brief history of the transaction that was the subject of debate. On the 8th of October, 1856, hostilities broke out between the English and Chinese at Canton on account of the seizure by the Chinese authorities of a *lorcha*, or small trading vessel, called "The Arrow," which sailed under the English flag. Yeh, the chief commissioner of Canton, would hold with the English admiral no intercourse that might facilitate an arrangement of the dispute. The Englishman adopted the course, not unusual with his countrymen, of compelling this courtesy by cannon-balls. The Government at home justified this warlike conduct by the plea that the Chinese had infringed the treaty of 1842. The Opposition perceived, however, that something might be made out of the transaction. On the 24th of February, 1857, Lord Derby brought forward a motion in the House of Lords censuring the operations at Canton, and blaming the Government for not discountenancing their admiral on that station. After two nights' debate a majority declared against Lord Derby. On the very night of the Ministerial triumph in the Upper House, February 26th, a motion similar in character to Lord Derby's was laid before the House of Commons by Mr. Cobden, who, together with his friends of the Peace party, had formed an ominous alliance with the Conservatives. A tremendous debate ensued, lasting four nights. Palmerston's bellicose interference with the small States of Europe had been amply discussed in the great debate on Greece, and had resulted in his triumph within Parliament, and the increase of his popularity without. The present protest against the indulgence of his pugnacious tastes, and the abuse of the principle involved in his famous quotation, "*Civis Romanus sum*," in the far-off regions of Asia, was endorsed by the vote of 263 members against 247 of his own supporters.

Relying on the English love of fighting and sympathy for what is called "pluck," the dauntless Premier hopefully committed the safety of his Government to the chances of a new election. His most sanguine expectations were exceeded as the elections went on. The Peace party was for a time annihilated. Manchester rejected the leaders of the Manchester school—Cobden, Bright, and Milner Gibson were all defeated and left outside of the House of Commons. The new Parliament, which assembled on May 7th, was so decidedly in favour of the Minister and so adverse to his foes, that Lord Palmerston was for a time dictator of the British empire. He had scarcely, however, resumed his seat on the right hand of the Speaker, when the fearful news arrived that there had broken out in India a wide-spread mutiny which threatened to tear that costly jewel from the British crown. This unlooked-for difficulty was formidable, not only from its suddenness, but from the great distance of the scene of action. What could be done was done promptly—troops and able generals were sent out. From May to October the Mutiny raged, and uncertainty prevailed in England as to its termination, until Delhi and Lucknow were both captured, and the ancient empire of the Great Mogul was secured to the domination of Queen Victoria. The Prime Minister's difficulty seemed to be overcome, and his government to be as strong and prosperous as ever, when, on the 14th of January, 1858, Orsini attempted the life of the Emperor of the French.

The time had now come when Lord Palmerston was doomed to feel the evil consequences of his personal intimacy with Prince Louis Napoleon. His natural horror at the attempted assassination made him precipitate in concurring with the suggestion of the French Minister that an Alien Act for the control of refugees in England should be passed through Parliament. The first reading of the bill had been carried by a very large majority, when a rumour that the French Minister had suggested the measure was spread abroad. The sensitive pride of the nation, already irritated by the offensive language

of certain French colonels, took fire, the press became indignant, the House of Commons loud in its patriotism. On the second reading of the bill the Government was defeated by a majority of nineteen, and Lord Palmerston resigned. The amendment by which the popular Minister was thus unexpectedly overthrown was moved and seconded by Messrs. Gibson and Bright, members of the Peace party, who had recovered seats in the House of Commons. This event happened on the 19th February, 1858. Lord Derby formed a Ministry, and the Liberals passed over to the Opposition side of the House. It must here be noticed that Lord Palmerston's defeat was accomplished by means of a combination of Lord Russell and the Radicals with the Peelites under Mr. Gladstone, and the Conservatives under Mr. Disraeli. The tenure of office by the Conservatives was precarious, depending, as it did, upon the support of men who had no political sympathy with the party they had raised to power. The late Premier, during his *quasi* dictatorship, had suffered himself on two or three occasions to forget the amenity of manner and good humour which made him a general favourite in the House of Commons. Several members had expressed their displeasure at the noble Viscount's arrogance and irritability; and on this fatal division of the 19th February, 1858, they united with his antagonists to humble him. For a period of fifteen months he studied in the cool shade of the Opposition benches the lessons of adversity—nor in vain. His old cheerfulness and *bonhomie* returned; he gradually drew nearer to Lord Russell, and strove to forget recent quarrels while he remembered ancient friendships. The Radicals soon wearied of their alliance with the Conservatives; and when Mr. Disraeli, in deference to their wishes, brought in a bill for Parliamentary Reform, they only laughed at a measure which smacked strongly of the novelist and romancer. This altered state of feeling on the Liberal benches began to produce its effect early in the session of 1859. On the motion for the second reading of the new Reform Bill, on March 21st, Lord Russell moved an amendment condemning the measure; and after some delay, and several nights' debate, an amendment was carried by a majority of thirty-nine. Nevertheless the Ministers did not resign. Lord Derby, following the example of Palmerston when defeated on the China question, recommended the Queen to dissolve Parliament and appeal to the constituencies. No popular enthusiasm, however, could be roused in favour of Disraeli's Reform Bill, and the new elections did not strengthen the Ministry in the House of Commons. The existence of the Conservative Government was prolonged only by the divisions among its opponents. Great efforts were made to overcome these internal discords; and at length, on the 2nd of June, a large meeting of three hundred Liberal members was held at Willis's Rooms, for the purpose of reconciling the jarring elements of the party. The compact that ensued bound the Radicals to Lord Russell by the promise of a liberal Reform Bill, and reconciled the latter with Lord Palmerston by the understanding that he should have the control of Foreign Affairs if Palmerston became Premier. The campaign was then opened before the new Parliament was a week old. A vote of want of confidence was moved on the Address, and was carried by a majority of thirteen. Lord Derby resigned, and Palmerston again became prime minister. It was indeed time that some masterhand should take the reins of the Foreign Office from the feeble control of Lord Malmesbury.

The war between Sardinia and Austria had burst out almost as a surprise to the Conservative Ministers, who, up to the very commencement of hostilities, were making assurances to Parliament that all would yet be "peace." They certainly were not much in the confidence of Napoleon III., who felt their leaning to an Austrian rather than to a French Alliance. So sensible was the Austrian Government of the loss they would sustain by the change from Lord Derby to Lord Palmerston, that, as is said, they precipitated the war, and entered Sardinian territory on receiving news of the change in the English Ministry. Returning to power at a critical moment with a chastened spirit, Lord Palmerston adopted a conciliatory policy. He was able to exert his personal influence with the French Emperor on behalf of Italy, but he did not bow too low to that potentate. After the annexation of Savoy and Nice, he did not interfere with Lord Russell's public statement, that England must look to other quarters than France for alliances. He encouraged the raising of volunteer corps, and the erection of fortifications, which were justly considered as marks of distrust of France. All this, however, was avowedly done only by way of defence. The time for interfering in the affairs of foreign states with good effect having passed away, he frankly adopted the principle of non-intervention. His abiding conviction, and the distinguishing characteristic of his foreign policy, was the necessity of a firm alliance between England and France. It was natural that this should be his dominant thought during the eighteen years of Louis Philippe's peaceful reign, when he fought the fight of protocols with Thiers and Guizot, in a spirit very much like that with which he carried on the conflicts with the Opposition in the House of Commons, seeking no bloodier issue.

England and France had, during the reign of the citizen king, a certain community of political interests in advancing the prosperity and development of constitutional states; since then commercial interests have bound the countries closely together. No circumstance showed more clearly the change that had come over the spirit and policy of the once redoubtable Palmerston than the conduct of his administration in the Schlesvig and Holstein war. The change, however, was not so much in the Minister as in the people. The latter had come to the wise conclusion, that the nation's blood and treasure should not be spent in other people's quarrels, unless for very powerful and cogent reasons, and the aged Premier, obedient to his instincts, bowed to the popular decision.

That which, perhaps, caused the greatest perplexity to Lord Palmerston's Government was the disrupture of the United States of America.

The noble Viscount had all his life long been a staunch advocate for the abolition of slavery, therefore his sympathies were strongly in favour of the Northern States; but, on the other hand, a large proportion of the industrial wealth of England was absolutely dependent upon cotton. To the temptation of procuring this valued produce of the Slave States was added another, in the prospect of the abolition of custom dues in the ports of the seceding States. A popular Minister might have been pardoned for throwing the weight of his influence and power into the scale, and for opposing an unpopular cause; but whether restrained by the prudence of old age, or the greater foresight of his colleagues, Lord Palmerston did, fortunately for the peace of the world, abstain from interference in the civil war of North America.

We say nothing here of the expedition to Mexico, nor of English policy in reference to the last insurrection in Poland, because they present no points of interest that have a special bearing upon Lord Palmerston's career, excepting that they serve to further illustrate the determination of his Cabinet to maintain the principles of non-intervention. He is charged with having deserted Poland and Hungary in the time of their need, from a fear of the great Powers interested in their subjection. Had he done for those countries, it is said, what he did for Belgium, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, Italy, or even the Confederate States of America, he might have saved a free people and raised two nations of freemen in the heart of Europe. Alas! he could not go beyond his means. He was a powerful minister, but he was not an autocrat. He could steer in the direction of the gale of popular opinion, but, happily for us, he could do no more. The English people were not disposed to fight for Poland, and their sympathy for Hungary was very lukewarm, even after the eloquent appeals of Kossuth, which came too late for action. Lord Palmerston's interest centred in England. If he could help other nations without crippling his own country, well and good. If not, he would hold his hand. This appears to us to be the fairest way of appreciating his foreign policy. He was a man of the times—a creature of circumstance, like many other great men. So in domestic politics: when the revolutionary energy which animated the nation for thirty years, from the days of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill to the passing of the Jewish Disabilities Act, had spent itself, and a Conservative reaction was setting in, Lord Palmerston had the skill to seize the reins of power, and by the exercise of consummate tact to do, in the name of a Liberal, all the work that the Tories could have expected to do. The failure to abolish Church-rates was indicative at once of the weakness of Liberalism and of the true position of Lord Palmerston with regard to the two parties. By toning down the innovating temper of the party he professed to lead, he brought it to the level of the tempered Conservatism by which the Tories perforce were guided.

This was all very well for a season. It gave the nation time for calm reflection and self-examination as to its real wants and wishes. That those wishes will make themselves heard in the new Parliament, there is no reason to doubt. Earl Russell, with his past career vividly impressed upon the minds of his countrymen, will surely not be an obstruction in the way of reform. Mr. Gladstone will give all the energy of his ardent mind to the carrying out of any scheme that he believes to be for the good of the nation at large; while the Earl of Clarendon, as the depositary of the traditions of the Foreign Office, will be faithful to the spirit of a free and peaceful development of prosperity among all nations, as far as England may be able to contribute thereto.

In conclusion, our summary of Lord Palmerston's career is—that he was not precisely a great man, but a clever man; that, according to Coleridge's classification, he was not a man of genius, but a man of talent, that the sympathy he felt through his happy temperament for all varieties of humankind gave him a command of the House of Commons and of the general public that no man of splenetic mood could ever have compassed. He was genial, generous, manly, and in many other respects the representative of the best side of the English character. But while he was neither so logical as the typical Frenchman, nor so profound as the typical German, he was eminently practical; and, for his day, the best exponent of English feeling and English common-sense that could be found.

Art. IV.—Coleridge's Writings.

Conversations, Letters, and Recollections of S. T. Coleridge. Edited by Thomas Allsop. London: T. Farrah.

Forms of intellectual and spiritual culture often exercise their subtlest and most artful charm when life is already passing from them. Searching and irresistible as are the changes of the human spirit on its way to perfection, there is yet so much elasticity of temper that what must pass away sooner or later is not disengaged all at once even from the highest order of minds. Nature, which by one law of development evolves ideas, moralities, modes of inward life, and represses them in turn, has in this way provided that the earlier growth should propel its fibres into the later, and so transmit the whole of its forces in an unbroken continuity of life. Then comes the spectacle of the reserve of the elder generation exquisitely refined by the antagonism of the new. That current of new life chastens them as they contend against it. Weaker minds do not perceive the change, clearer minds abandon themselves to it. To feel the change everywhere, yet not to abandon oneself to it, is a situation of difficulty and contention. Communicating in this way to the passing stage of culture the charm of what is chastened, high-strung, athletic, they yet detach the highest minds from the past by pressing home its difficulties and finally proving

it impossible. Such is the charm of Julian, of St. Louis, perhaps of Luther; in the narrower compass of modern times, of Dr. Newman and Lacordaire; it is also the peculiar charm of Coleridge.

Modern thought is distinguished from ancient by its cultivation of the "relative" spirit in place of the "absolute." Ancient philosophy sought to arrest every object in an eternal outline, to fix thought in a necessary formula, and types of life in a classification by "kinds" or genera. To the modern spirit nothing is or can be rightly known except relatively under conditions. An ancient philosopher indeed started a philosophy of the relative, but only as an enigma. So the germs of almost all philosophical ideas were unfolded in the mind of antiquity, and fecundated one by one in after ages by the external influences of art, religion, culture in the natural sciences, belonging to a particular generation, which suddenly becomes pre-occupied by a formula or theory, not so much new as penetrated by a new meaning and expressiveness. So the idea of "the relative" has been fecundated in modern times by the influence of the sciences of observation. These sciences reveal types of life evanescing into each other by inexpressible refinements of change. Things pass into their opposites by accumulation of undefinable quantities. The growth of those sciences, consists in a continual analysis of facts of rough and general observation into groups of facts more precise and minute. A faculty for truth is a power of distinguishing and fixing delicate and fugitive details. The moral world is ever in contact with the physical; the relative spirit has invaded moral philosophy from the ground of the inductive sciences. There it has started a new analysis of the relations of body and mind, good and evil, freedom and necessity. Hard and abstract moralities are yielding to a more exact estimate of the subtlety and complexity of our life. Always as an organism increases in perfection the conditions of its life become more complex. Man is the most complex of the products of nature. Character merges into temperament; the nervous system refines itself into intellect. His physical organism is played upon not only by the physical conditions about it, but by remote laws of inheritance, the vibrations of long past acts reaching him in the midst of the new order of things in which he lives. When we have estimated these conditions he is not yet simple and isolated; for the mind of the race, the character of the age, sway him this way or that through the medium of language and ideas. It seems as if the most opposite statements about him were alike true; he is so receptive, all the influences of the world and of society ceaselessly playing upon him, so that every hour in his life is unique, changed altogether by a stray word, or glance, or touch. The truth of these relations experience gives us; not the truth of eternal outlines effected once for all, but a world of fine gradations and subtly linked conditions, shifting intricately as we ourselves change; and bids us by constant clearing of the organs of observation and perfecting of analysis to make what we can of these. To the intellect, to the critical spirit, these subtleties of effect are more precious than anything else. What is lost in precision of form is gained in intricacy of expression. To suppose that what is called "ontology" is what the speculative instinct seeks is the misconception of a backward school of logicians. Who would change the colour or curve of a roseleaf for that *οὐσία ἀχρώματος, ἀσχημάτιστος, ἀναφὴς*. A transcendentalism that makes what is abstract more excellent than what is concrete has nothing akin to the leading philosophies of the world. The true illustration of the speculative temper is not the Hindoo, lost to sense, understanding, individuality; but such an one as Göthe, to whom every moment of life brought its share of experimental, individual knowledge, by whom no touch of the world of form, colour, and passion was disregarded.

The literary life of Coleridge was a disinterested struggle against the application of the relative spirit to moral and religious questions. Everywhere he is restlessly scheming to apprehend the absolute; to affirm it effectively; to get it acknowledged. Coleridge failed in that attempt, happily even for him, for it was a struggle against the increasing life of the mind itself. The real loss was, that this controversial interest betrayed him into a direction which was not for him the path of the highest intellectual success; a direction in which his artistic talent could never find the conditions of its perfection. Still, there is so much witchery about his poems, that it is as a poet that he will most probably be permanently remembered. How did his choice of a controversial interest, his determination to affirm the absolute, weaken or modify his poetical gift?

In 1798 he joined Wordsworth in the composition of a volume of poems—the "Lyrical Ballads." What Wordsworth then wrote is already vibrant with that blithe *élan* which carried him to final happiness and self-possession. In Coleridge we feel already that faintness and obscure dejection which cling like some contagious damp to all his writings. Wordsworth was to be distinguished by a joyful and penetrative conviction of the existence of certain latent affinities between nature and the human mind, which reciprocally gild the mind and nature with a kind of "heavenly alchemy."

> ——— "My voice proclaims
> How exquisitely the individual mind
> (And the progressive powers perhaps no less
> Of the whole species,) to the external world
> Is fitted:—and how exquisitely, too,
> The external world is fitted to the mind:
> And the creation, by no lower name
> Can it be called, which they with blended might
> Accomplish."*

In Wordsworth this took the form of an unbroken dreaming over the aspects and transitions of nature, a reflective, but altogether unformulated, analysis of them.

There are in Coleridge's Poems expressions of this conviction as deep as Wordsworth's.

* Preface to the "Excursion."

But Coleridge could never have abandoned himself to the dream as Wordsworth did, because the first condition of such abandonment is an unvexed quietness of heart. No one can read the "Lines composed above Tintern" without feeling how potent the physical element was among the conditions of Wordsworth's genius:—"felt in the blood and felt along the heart,"—"My whole life I have lived in quiet thought." The stimulus which most artists require from nature he can renounce. He leaves the ready-made glory of the Swiss mountains to reflect a glory on a mouldering leaf. He loves best to watch the floating thistledown, because of its hint at an unseen life in the air. Coleridge's temperament, *ἀεί ἐν σφοδρᾷ-δρέξει*, with its faintness, its grieved dejection, could never have been like that.

"My genial spirits fail;
And what can these avail
To lift the smothering weight from off my breast?
It were a vain endeavour.
Though I should gaze for ever
On that green light that lingers in the west:
I may not hope from outward forms to win
The passion and the life whose fountains are within."

It is that flawless temperament in Wordsworth which keeps his conviction of a latent intelligence in nature within the limits of sentiment or instinct, and confines it to those delicate and subdued shades of expression which perfect art allows. In sadder dispositions, that is in the majority of cases, where such a conviction has existed, it has stiffened into a formula, it has frozen into a scientific or pseudo-scientific theory. For the perception of those affinities brings one so near the absorbing speculative problems of life—optimism, the proportion of man to his place in nature, his prospects in relation to it—that it ever tends to become theory through their contagion. Even in Göthe, who has brilliantly handled the subject in his lyrics entitled "Gott und Welt," it becomes something stiffer than poetry; it is tempered by the "pale cast" of his technical knowledge of the nature of colours, of anatomy, of the metamorphosis of plants.

That, however, which had only a limited power over Coleridge as sentiment, entirely possessed him as a philosophical idea. We shall see in what follows how deep its power was, how it pursued him everywhere, and seemed to him to interpret every question. Wordsworth's poetry is an optimism; it says man's relation to the world is, and may be seen by man to be, a perfect relation; but it is an optimism that begins and ends in an abiding instinct. Coleridge accepts the same optimism as a philosophical idea, but an idea is relative to an intellectual assent; sometimes it seems a better expression of facts, sometimes a worse, as the understanding weighs it in the logical balances. And so it is not a permanent consolation. It is only in the rarer moments of intellectual warmth and sunlight that it is entirely credible. In less exhilarating moments that perfect relation of man and nature seems to shift and fail; that is, the philosophical idea ceases to be realizable; and with Coleridge its place is not supplied, as with Wordsworth, by the corresponding sentiment or instinct.

What in Wordsworth is a sentiment or instinct, is in Coleridge a philosophical idea. In other words, Coleridge's talent is a more intellectual one than Wordsworth's, more dramatic, more self-conscious. Wordsworth's talent, deeply reflective as it is, because its base is an instinct, is deficient in self-knowledge. Possessed by the rumours and voices of the haunted country, the borders of which he has passed alone, he never thinks of withdrawing from it to look down upon it from one of the central heights of human life. His power absorbs him, not he it; he cannot turn it round or get without it; he does not estimate its general relation to life. But Coleridge, just because the essence of his talent is the intuition of an idea, commands his talent. He not only feels with Wordsworth the expression of mind in nature, but he can project that feeling outside him, reduce it to a psychological law, define its relation to other elements of culture, place it in a complete view of life.

And in some such activity as that, varied as his wide learning, in a many-sided dramatic kind of poetry, assigning its place and value to every mode of the inward life, seems to have been for Coleridge the original path of artistic success. But in order to follow that path one must hold ideas loosely in the relative spirit, not seek to stereotype any one of the many modes of that life; one must acknowledge that the mind is ever greater than its own products, devote ideas to the service of art rather than of *γνῶσις*, not disquiet oneself about the absolute. Perhaps Coleridge is more interesting because he did not follow this path. Repressing his artistic interest and voluntarily discolouring his own work, he turned to console and strengthen the human mind, vulgarized or dejected, as he believed, by the acquisition of new knowledge about itself in the "*éclaircissement*" of the eighteenth century.

What the reader of our own generation will least find in Coleridge's prose writings is the excitement of the literary sense. And yet in those grey volumes we have the production of one who made way ever by a charm, the charm of voice, of aspect, of language, above all, by the intellectual charm of new, moving, luminous ideas. Perhaps the chief offence in Coleridge is an excess of seriousness, a seriousness that arises not from any moral principle, but from a misconception of the perfect manner. There is a certain shade of levity and unconcern, the perfect manner of the eighteenth century, which marks complete culture in the handling of abstract questions. The humanist, he who possesses that complete culture, does not weep over the failure of a theory of the quantification of the predicate, nor shriek over the fall of a philosophical formula. A kind of humour is one of the conditions of the true mental attitude in the criticism of

past stages of thought. Humanity cannot afford to be too serious about them, any more than a man of good sense can afford to be too serious in looking back upon his own childhood. Plato, whom Coleridge claims as the first of his spiritual ancestors, Plato, as we remember him, a true humanist, with Petrarch and Göthe and M. Renan, holds his theories lightly, glances with a blithe and naïve inconsequence from one view to another, not anticipating the burden of meaning "views" will one day have for humanity. In reading him one feels how lately it was that Crœsus thought it a paradox to say that external prosperity was not necessarily happiness. But on Coleridge lies the whole weight of the sad reflection that has since come into the world, with which for us the air is full, which the children in the market-place repeat to each other. Even his language is forced and broken, lest some saving formula should be lost —distinctities, enucleation, pentad of operative Christianity—he has a whole vocabulary of such phrases, and expects to turn the tide of human thought by fixing the sense of such expressions as reason, understanding, idea.

Again, he has not the jealousy of the true artist in excluding all associations that have no charm or colour or gladness in them; everywhere he allows the impress of an inferior theological literature; he is often prolix and importunate about most indifferent heroes— Sir Alexander Ball, Dr. Bell, even Dr. Bowyer, the coarse pedant of the Blue-coat School. And the source of all this is closely connected with the source of his literary activity. For Coleridge had chosen as the mark of his literary egotism a kind of intellectual *tour de force* —to found a religious philosophy, to do something with the idea in spite of the essential nature of the idea. And therefore all is fictitious from the beginning. He had determined, that which is humdrum, insipid, which the human spirit has done with, shall yet stimulate and inspire. What he produced symbolizes this purpose—the mass of it *ennuyant*, depressing: the "Aids to Reflection," for instance, with Archbishop Leighton's vague pieties all twisted into the jargon of a spiritualistic philosophy. But sometimes "the pulse of the God's blood" does transmute it, kindling here and there a spot that begins to live; as in that beautiful fragment at the end of the "Church and State,"* or in the distilled and concentrated beauty of such a passage as this,—

"The first range of hills, that encircles the scanty vale of human life, is the horizon for the majority of its inhabitants. On its ridges the common sun is born and departs. From them the stars rise, and touching them they vanish. By the many, even this range, the natural limit and bulwark of the vale, is but imperfectly known. Its higher ascents are too often hidden by mists and clouds from uncultivated swamps, which few have courage or curiosity to penetrate. To the multitude below these vapours appear now as the dark haunts of terrific agents, on which none may intrude with impunity; and now all a-glow, with colours not their own, they are gazed at as the splendid palaces of happiness and power. But in all ages there have been a few who, measuring and sounding the rivers of the vale at the feet of their furthest inaccessible falls, have learned that the sources must be far higher and far inward; a few who, even in the level streams, have detected elements which neither the vale itself nor the surrounding mountains contained or could supply."—Biographia Literaria, vol. I. p. 247.

"I was driven from life in motion to life in thought and sensation." So Coleridge sums up his childhood with its delicacy, its sensitiveness, and passion. From his tenth to his eighteenth year he was at a rough school in London. Speaking of this time, he says:—

"When I was first plucked up and transplanted from my birth-place and family, Providence, it has often occurred to me, gave me the first intimation that it was my lot, and that it was best for me, to make or find my way of life a detached individual, a *terræ filius*, who was to ask love or service of no one on any more specific relation than that of being a man, and as such to take my chance for the free charities of humanity."*

Even his fine external nature was for years repressed, wronged, driven inward—"at fourteen I was in a continual state of low fever." He becomes a dreamer, an eager student, but without ambition.

This depressed boy is nevertheless, on the spiritual side, the child of a noble house. At twenty-five he is exercising a wonderful charm, and has defined for himself a peculiar line of intellectual activity. He had left Cambridge without a degree, a Unitarian. Unable to take orders, he determined through Southey's influence to devote himself to literature. When he left Cambridge there was a prejudice against him which has given occasion to certain suspicions. Those who knew him best discredit these suspicions. What is certain is that he was subject to fits of violent, sometimes fantastic, despondency. He retired to Stowey, in Somersetshire, to study poetry and philosophy. In 1797 his poetical gift was in full flower; he wrote "Kubla Khan," the first part of "Christabel," and the "Ancient Mariner." His literary success grew in spite of opposition. He had a strange attractive gift of conversation, or rather of monologue, as De Stael said, full of *bizarrerie*, with the rapid alternations of a dream, and here and there a sudden summons into a world strange to the hearer, abounding with images drawn from a sort of divided, imperfect life, as of one to whom the external world penetrated only in part, and blended with all this passages of the deepest obscurity, precious only for their musical cadence, the echo in Coleridge of the eloquence of the older English writers, of whom he was so ardent a lover. All through this brilliant course we may discern the power of the Asiatic temperament, of that voluptuousness which is perhaps connected with his appreciation of the intimacy, the almost mystical *rap-*

* Page 208.

* Biographical Supplement to Biographia Literaria, chap. ii.

port between man and nature. "I am much better," he writes, "and my new and tender health is all over me like a voluptuous feeling."

And whatever fame, or charm, or life-inspiring gift he has had is the vibration of the interest he excited then, the propulsion into years that clouded his early promise of that first buoyant, irresistible self-assertion: so great is even the indirect power of a sincere effort towards the ideal life, of even a temporary escape of the spirit from routine. Perhaps, the surest sign of his election—that he was indeed, on the spiritual side, the child of a noble house—is that story of the Pantisocratic scheme, which at this distance looks so grotesque. In his enthusiasm for the French Revolution, the old communistic dream with its appeal to nature (perhaps a little theatrical), touched him, as it had touched Rousseau, Saint-Pierre, and Chateaubriand. He had married one, his affection for whom seems to have been only a passing feeling; with her and a few friends he was to found a communistic settlement on the banks of the Susquehannah —"the name was pretty and metrical." It was one of Coleridge's lightest dreams; but also one which could only have passed through the liberal air of his earlier life. The later years of the French Revolution, which for us have discredited all such dreams, deprived him of that youthfulness which is the preservative element in a literary talent.

In 1798, he visited Germany. A beautiful fragment of this period remains, describing a spring excursion to the Brocken. His excitement still vibrates in it. Love, all joyful states of mind, are self-expressive; they loosen the tongue, they fill the thoughts with sensuous images, they harmonise one with the world of sight. We hear of the "rich graciousness and courtesy" of Coleridge's manner, of the white and delicate skin, the abundant black hair, the full, almost animal lips, that whole physiognomy of the dreamer already touched with fanaticism. One says of the text of one of his Unitarian sermons, "his voice rose like a stream of rich distilled perfumes;" another, "he talks like an angel, and does—nothing."

Meantime, he had designed an intellectual novelty in the shape of a religious philosophy. Socinian theology and the philosophy of Hartley had become distasteful. "Whatever is against right reason, that no faith can oblige us to believe." Coleridge quotes these words from Jeremy Taylor. And yet ever since the dawn of the Renaissance, had subsisted a conflict between reason and faith. From the first, indeed, the Christian religion had affirmed the existence of such a conflict, and had even based its plea upon its own weakness in it. In face of the classical culture, with its deep wide-struck roots in the world as it permanently exists, St. Paul asserted the claims of that which could not appeal with success to any genuinely human principle. Paradox as it was, that was the strength of the new spirit; for how much is there at all times in humanity which cannot appeal with success for encouragement or tolerance to any genuinely human principle. In the Middle Ages it might seem that faith had reconciled itself to philosophy; the Catholic church was the leader of the world's life as well as of the spirit's. Looking closer we see that the conflict is still latent there; the supremacy of faith is only a part of the worship of sorrow and weakness which marks the age. The weak are no longer merely a majority, they are all Europe. It is not that faith has become one with reason; but a strange winter, a strange suspension of life, has passed over the classical culture which is only the human reason in its most trenchant form. Glimpse after glimpse, as that pagan culture awoke to life the conflict was felt once more. It is at the court of Frederick II. that the Renaissance first becomes discernible as an actual power in European society. How definite and unmistakable is the attitude of faith towards that! Ever since the Reformation all phases of theology had been imperfect philosophies, reluctant philosophies—that is, in which there was a religious *arrière pensée;* philosophies which could never be in the ascendant in a sincerely scientific sphere. The two elements had never really mixed. Writers so different as Locke and Taylor have each his liberal philosophy, and each has his defence of the orthodox belief; but, also, each has a divided mind: we wonder how the two elements could have existed side by side; brought together in a single mind, but unable to fuse in it, they reveal their radical contrariety. The Catholic church and humanity are two powers that divide the intellect and spirit of man. On the Catholic side is faith, rigidly logical as Ultramontanism, with a proportion of the facts of life, that is, all that is despairing in life coming naturally under its formula. On the side of humanity is all that is desirable in the world, all that is sympathetic with its laws, and succeeds through that sympathy. Doubtless, for the individual, there are a thousand intermediate shades of opinion, a thousand resting-places for the religious spirit; still, τὸ διορίζειν οὐκ ἔστι τῶν πολλῶν, fine distinctions are not for the majority; and this makes time eventually a dogmatist, working out the opposition in its most trenchant form, and fixing the horns of the dilemma; until, in the present day, we have on one side Pius IX., the true descendant of the fisherman, issuing the Encyclical, pleading the old promise against the world with a special kind of justice; and on the other side, the irresistible modern culture, which, as religious men often remind us, is only Christian accidentally.

The peculiar temper of Coleridge's intellect made the idea of reconciling this conflict very seductive. With a true speculative talent he united a false kind of subtlety and the full share of vanity. A dexterous intellectual *tour de force* has always an independent charm; and therefore it is well for the cause of truth that the directness, sincerity, and naturalness of things are beyond a certain limit sacrificed in vain to a factitious interest. A method so forced as that of Coleridge's religious philosophy is from the first doomed to

be insipid, so soon as the temporary interest or taste or curiosity it was designed to meet has passed away. Then, as to the manner of such books as the "Aids to Reflection," or "The Friend:"—These books came from one whose vocation was in the world of art; and yet, perhaps, of all books that have been influential in modern times, they are farthest from the classical form—bundles of notes—the original matter inseparably mixed up with that borrowed from others—the whole just that mere preparation for an artistic effect which the finished artist would be careful one day to destroy. Here, again, we have a trait profoundly characteristic of Coleridge. He often attempts to reduce a phase of thought subtle and exquisite to conditions too rough for it. He uses a purely speculative gift in direct moral edification. Scientific truth is something fugitive, relative, full of fine gradations; he tries to fix it in absolute formulas. The "Aids to Reflection," or "The Friend," is an effort to propagate the volatile spirit of conversation into the less ethereal fabric of a written book; and it is only here and there that the poorer matter becomes vibrant, is really lifted by the spirit.

At forty-two, we find Coleridge saying, in a letter:—

"I feel with an intensity unfathomable by words my utter nothingness, impotence, and worthlessness in and for myself. I have learned what a sin is against an infinite, imperishable being such as is the soul of man. The consolations, at least the sensible sweetness of hope, I do not possess. On the contrary, the temptation which I have constantly to fight up against is a fear that, if annihilation and the possibility of heaven were offered to my choice, I should choose the former."*

What was the cause of this change? That is precisely the point on which, after all the gossip there has been, we are still ignorant. At times Coleridge's opium excesses were great; but what led to those excesses must not be left out of account. From boyhood he had a tendency to low fever, betrayed by his constant appetite for bathing and swimming, which he indulged even when a physician had opposed it. In 1803, he went to Malta as secretary to the English Governor. His daughter suspects that the source of the evil was there, that for one of his constitution the climate of Malta was deadly. At all events, when he returned, the charm of those five wonderful years had failed at the source.

De Quincey said of him, "he wanted better bread than can be made with wheat." Lamb said of him that from boyhood he had "hungered for eternity." Henceforth those are the two notes of his life. From this time we must look for no more true literary talent in him. His style becomes greyer and greyer, his thoughts *outré*, exaggerated, a kind of credulity or superstition exercised upon abstract words. Like Clifford, in Hawthorne's beautiful romance—the born Epicurean, who by some strange wrong has passed the best of his days in a prison—he is the victim of a division of the will, often showing itself in trivial things: he could never choose on which side of the garden path he would walk. In 1803, he wrote a poem on "The Pains of Sleep." That unrest increased. Mr. Gillman tells us "he had long been greatly afflicted with nightmare, and when residing with us was frequently aroused from this painful sleep by any one of the family who might hear him."

That faintness and continual dissolution had its own consumptive refinements, and even brought as to the "Beautiful Soul," in "Wilhelm Meister," a faint religious ecstacy—that singing in the sails which is not of the breeze. Here, again, is a note of Coleridge's:—

"In looking at objects of nature while I am thinking, as at yonder moon, dim-glimmering through the window-pane, I seem rather to be seeking, as it were asking, a symbolical language for something within me that already and for ever exists, than observing anything new. Even when that latter is the case, yet still I have always an obscure feeling, as if that new phenomenon were the dim awakening of a forgotten or hidden truth of my inner nature." Then, "while I was preparing the pen to write this remark, I lost the train of thought which had led me to it."

What a distemper of the eye of the mind! With an almost bodily distemper there is in that!

Coleridge's intellectual sorrows were many; but he had one singular intellectual happiness. With an inborn-taste for transcendental philosophy, he lived just at the time when that philosophy took an immense spring in Germany, and connected itself with a brilliant literary movement. He had the luck to light upon it in its freshness, and introduce it to his countrymen. What an opportunity for one reared on the colourless English philosophies, but who feels an irresistible attraction towards metaphysical synthesis! How rare are such occasions of intellectual contentment! This transcendental philosophy, chiefly as systematized by Schelling, Coleridge applies with an eager, unwearied subtlety, to the questions of theology and art-criticism. It is in his theory of art-criticism that he comes nearest to true and important principles; that is the least fugitive part of his work. Let us take this first; here we shall most clearly apprehend his main principle.

What, then, is the essence of this criticism? On the whole it may be described as an attempt to reclaim the world of art as a world of fixed laws—to show that the creative activity of genius and the simplest act of thought are but higher and lower products of the laws of a universal logic. Criticism, feeling its own unsuccess in dealing with the greater works of art, has sometimes made too much of those dark and capricious suggestions of genius which even the intellect possessed by them is unable to track or recal. It has seemed due to their half-sacred character to look for no link between the process by which they were produced and the slighter processes of the mind. Coleridge assumes that the highest phases of thought must be more, not less, than the lower subjects of law.

With this interest, in the "Biographia Literaria," he refines Schelling's "Philosophy of Na-

* Quoted in Gillman's "Life of Coleridge."

ture" into a theory of art. "Es giebt kein Plagiat in der Philosophie," says Heine, alluding to the charge brought against Schelling of unacknowledged borrowing from Bruno;* and certainly that which is common to Coleridge and Schelling is of far earlier origin than the Renaissance. Schellingism, the "Philosophy of Nature," is indeed a constant tradition in the history of thought; it embodies a permanent type of the speculative temper. That mode of conceiving nature as a mirror or reflex of the intelligence of man may be traced up to the first beginnings of Greek speculation. There are two ways of envisaging those aspects of nature which appear to bear the impress of reason or intelligence. There is the deist's way, which regards them merely as marks of design, which separates the informing mind from nature as the mechanist from the machine; and there is the pantheistic way, which identifies the two, which regards nature itself as the living energy of an intelligence of the same kind as, but vaster than, the human. Greek philosophy, finding indications of mind everywhere, dwelling exclusively in its observations on that which is general or formal, on that which modern criticism regards as the modification of things by the mind of the observer, adopts the latter, or pantheistic way, through the influence of the previous mythological period. Mythology begins in the early necessities of language, of which it is a kind of accident. But at a later period its essence changes; it becomes what it was not at its birth, the servant of a genuine poetic interest, a kind of *virification* of nature. Played upon by those accidents of language, the Greek mind becomes possessed by the conception of nature as living, thinking, almost speaking to the mind of man. This unfixed poetical prepossession reduced to an abstract form, petrified into an idea, is the conception which gives a unity of aim to Greek philosophy. Step by step it works out the substance of the Hegelian formula: "Was ist, das ist vernunftig; was vernunftig ist, das ist" —Whatever is, is according to reason; whatever is according to reason, that is. A science of which that could be the formula is still but an intellectual aspiration; the formula of true science is different. Experience, which has gradually saddened the earth's colour, stiffened its motions, withdrawn from it some blithe and debonair presence, has moderated our demands upon science. The positive method makes very little account of marks of intelligence in nature; in its wider view of phenomena it sees that those incidents are a minority, and may rank as happy coincidences; it absorbs them in the simpler conception of law. But the suspicion of a mind latent in nature, struggling for release and intercourse with the intellect of man through true ideas, has never ceased to haunt a certain class of minds. Started again and again in successive periods by enthusiasts on the antique pattern, in each case the thought has seemed paler and more evanescent amidst the growing consistency and sharpness of outline of other and more positive forms of knowledge. Still, wherever a speculative instinct has been united with extreme inwardness of temperament, as in Jakob Böhme, there the old Greek conception, like some seed floating in the air, has taken root and sprung up anew. Coleridge, thrust inward upon himself, driven from "life in thought and sensation" to life in thought only, feels in that dark London school a thread of the Greek mind vibrating strangely in him. At fifteen he is discoursing on Plotinus, and has translated the hymns of Synesius. So in later years he reflects from Schelling the flitting tradition. He conceives a subtle co-ordination between the ideas of the mind and the laws of the natural world. Science is to be attained not by observation, analysis, generalization, but by the evolution or recovery of those ideas from within by a sort of *ἀνάμνησις*, every group of observed facts remaining an enigma until the appropriate idea is struck upon them from the mind of Newton or Cuvier, the genius in whom sympathy with the universal reason is entire. Next he supposes that this reason or intelligence in nature gradually becomes reflective—self-conscious. He fancies he can track through all the simpler orders of life fragments of an eloquent prophecy about the human mind. He regards the whole of nature as a development of higher forms out of the lower through shade after shade of systematic change. The dim stir of chemical atoms towards the axes of a crystal form, the trance-like life of plants, the animal troubled by strange irritabilities, are stages which anticipate consciousness. All through that increasing stir of life this was forming itself; each stage in its unsatisfied susceptibilities seeming to be drawn out of its own limits by the more pronounced current of life on its confines, the "shadow of approaching humanity" gradually deepening, the latent intelligence working to the surface. At this point the law of development does not lose itself in caprice; rather it becomes more constraining and incisive. From the lowest to the highest acts of intelligence there is another range of refining shades. Gradually the mind concentrates itself, frees itself from the limits of the particular, the individual, attains a strange power of modifying and centralizing what it receives from without according to an inward ideal. At last, in imaginative genius, ideas become effective; the intelligence of nature, with all its elements connected and justified, is clearly reflected; and the interpretation of its latent purposes is fixed in works of art.

In this fanciful and bizarre attempt to rationalize art, to range it under the dominion of law, there is still a gap to be filled up. What is that common law of the mind of which a work of art and the slighter acts of thought are alike products? Here Coleridge weaves in Kant's fine-spun theory of the transformation of sense into perception. What every theory of perception has to explain is that associative power which gathers isolated sensible qualities into the objects of the world about us. Sense, without an associative power, would be only a threadlike stream of colours, sounds, odours—each struck upon one for a moment and then withdrawn. The basis of this association may be represented as a material one, a kind of many-coloured "etch-

* "Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland," buch 3.

ing" on the brain. Hartley has dexterously handled this hypothesis. The charm of his "theory of vibrations" is the vivid image it presents to the fancy. How large an element in a speculative talent is the command of these happy images! Coleridge, by a finer effort of the same kind, a greater delicacy of fancy, detects all sorts of slips, transitions, breaks of continuity in Hartley's glancing cobweb. Coleridge, with Kant, regards all association as effected by a power within, to which he gives a fanciful Greek name.* In an act of perception there is the matter which sense presents, colour, tone, feeling; but also a form or mould, such as space, unity, causation, suggested from within. In these forms we arrest and frame the many attributes of sense. It is like that simple chemical phenomenon where two colourless fluids uniting reflect a full colour. Neither matter nor form can be perceived asunder, they unite into the many-coloured image of life. This theory has not been able to bear a loyal induction. Even if it were true, how little it would tell us; how it attenuates fact! There, again, the charm is all in the clear image; the image of the artist combining a few elementary colours, curves, sounds into a new whole. Well, this power of association, of concentrating many elements of sense in an object of perception, is refined and deepened into the creative acts of imagination

We of the modern ages have become so familiarized with the greater works of art that we are little sensitive of the act of creation in them; they do not impress us as a new presence in the world. Only sometimes in productions which realize immediately a profound emotion and enforce a change in taste, such as "Werther" or "Emile," we are actual witnesses of the moulding of an unforeseen type by some new principle of association. By imagination, the distinction between which and fancy is so thrust upon his readers, Coleridge means a vigorous act of association, which, by simplifying and restraining their natural expression to an artificial order, refines and perfects the types of human passion. It represents the excitements of the human mind, but reflected in a new manner, "excitement itself imitating order." "Originally the offspring of passion," he somewhere says, "but now the adopted children of power." So far there is nothing new or distinctive; every one who can receive from a poem or picture a total impression will admit so much. What makes the view distinctive in Coleridge are the Schellingistic associations with which he colours it, that faint glamour of the philosophy of nature which was ever influencing his thoughts. That suggested the idea of a subtly winding parallel, a "rapport" in every detail, between the human mind and the world without it, laws of nature being so many transformed ideas. Conversely, the ideas of the human mind would be only transformed laws. Genius would be in a literal sense an exquisitely purged sympathy with nature. Those associative conceptions of the imagination, those unforeseen types of passion, would come not so much of the artifice and invention of the understanding as from self-surrender to the suggestions of nature; they would be evolved by the stir of nature itself realizing the highest reach of its latent intelligence; they would have a kind of antecedent necessity to rise at some time to the surface of the human mind.

It is natural that Shakspeare should be the idol of all such criticism, whether in England or Germany. The first effect in Shakspeare is that of capricious detail, of the waywardness that plays with the parts careless of the impression of the whole. But beyond there is the constraining unity of effect, the uneffaceable impression of "Hamlet" or "Macbeth." His hand moving freely is curved round by some law of gravitation from within; that is, there is the most constraining unity in the most abundant variety. Coleridge exaggerates this unity into something like the unity of a natural organism, the associative act that effected it into something closely akin to the primitive power of nature itself. "In the Shakspearian drama," he says, "there is a vitality which grows and evolves itself from within." Again,

> "He, too, worked in the spirit of nature, by evolving the germ from within by the imaginative power according to the idea. For as the power of seeing is to light, so is an idea in mind to a law in nature. They are correlatives which suppose each other."

Again,

> "The organic form is innate; it shapes, as it developes, itself from within, and the fulness of its development is one and the same with the perfection of its outward form. Such as the life is, such is the form. Nature, the prime genial artist, inexhaustible in diverse powers, is equally inexhaustible in forms; each exterior is the physiognomy of the being within, and even such is the appropriate excellence of Shakspeare, himself a nature humanised, a genial understanding, directing self-consciously a power and an implicit wisdom deeper even than our consciousness."

There "the absolute" has been affirmed in the sphere of art; and thought begins to congeal. Coleridge has not only overstrained the elasticity of his hypothesis, but has also obscured the true interest of art. For after all the artist has become something almost mechanical; instead of being the most luminous and self-possessed phase of consciousness, the associative act itself looks like some organic process of assimilation. The work of art is sometimes likened to the living organism. That expresses the impression of a self-delighting, independent life which a finished work of art gives us; it does not express the process by which that work was produced. Here there is no blind ferment of lifeless elements to realize a type. By exquisite analysis the artist attains clearness of idea, then by many stages of refining clearness of expression. He moves slowly over his work, calculating the tenderest tone, and restraining the subtlest curve, never letting his hand or fancy move at large, gradually refining flaccid spaces to the higher degree of expressiveness. Culture, at least, values even in transcendent works of art the power of the understanding in them, their logical process of

* Esemplastic, *εἰς ἓν πλάττειν.*

construction, the spectacle of supreme intellectual dexterity which they afford.

Coleridge's criticism may well be remembered as part of the long pleading of German culture for the things "behind the veil." It recals us from the work of art to the mind of the artist; and after all, this is what is infinitely precious, and the work of art only as the index of it. Still, that is only the narrower side of a complete criticism. Perhaps it is true, as some one says in Lessing's "Emilie Galotti," that, if Michael Angelo had been born without hands, he would still have been the greatest of artists. But we must admit the truth also of an opposite view: "In morals as in art," says M. Renan, "the word is nothing—the fact is everything. The idea which lurks under a picture of Raphael is a slight matter; it is the picture itself only that counts."

What constitutes an artistic gift is first of all a natural susceptibility to moments of strange excitement, in which the colours freshen upon our threadbare world, and the routine of things about us is broken by a novel and happier synthesis. These are moments into which other minds may be made to enter, but which they cannot originate. This susceptibility is the element of genius in an artistic gift. Secondly, there is what may be called the talent of projection, of throwing these happy moments into an external concrete form—a statue, or play, or picture. That projection is of all degrees of completeness; its facility and transparence are modified by the circumstances of the individual, his culture and his age. When it is perfectly transparent, the work is classical. Compare the power of projection in Mr. Browning's "Sordello," with that power in the "Sorrows of Werther." These two elements determine the two chief aims of criticism. First, it has to classify those initiative moments according to the amount of interest excited in them, to estimate their comparative acceptability, their comparative power of giving joy to those who undergo them. Secondly, it has to test, by a study of the artistic product itself, in connexion with the intellectual and spiritual condition of its age, the completeness of the projection. These two aims form the positive, or concrete side of criticism; their direction is not towards a metaphysical definition of the universal element in an artistic effort, but towards a subtle gradation of the shades of difference between one artistic gift and another. This side of criticism is infinitely varied; and it is what French culture more often achieves than the German.

Coleridge has not achieved this side in an equal degree with the other; and this want is not supplied by the "Literary Remains," which contain his studies on Shakspeare. There we have a repetition, not an application, of the absolute formula. Coleridge is like one who sees in a picture only the rules of perspective, and is always trying to simplify even these. Thus, "Where there is no humour, but only wit, or the like, there is no growth from within." "What is beauty?" he asks. "It is the unity of the manifold, the coalescence of the diverse." So of Dante:—"There is a total impression of infinity; the wholeness is not in vision or conception, but in an inner feeling of totality and absolute being." Again, of the "Paradise Lost:"—"It has the totality of the poem as distinguished from the *ab ovo* birth and parentage or straight line of history."

That exaggerated inwardness is barren. Here, too, Coleridge's thoughts require to be thawed, to be set in motion. He is admirable in the detection, the analysis and statement, of a few of the highest general laws of art-production. But he withdraws us too far from what we can see, hear and feel. Doubtless, the idea, the intellectual element, is the spirit and life of art. Still art is the triumph of the senses and the emotions; and the senses and the emotions must not be cheated of their triumph after all. That strange and beautiful psychology which he employs, with its evanescent delicacies, has not sufficient corporeity. Again, one feels that the discussion about Hartley, meeting us in the way, throws a tone of insecurity over the critical theory which it introduces. Its only effect is to win for the terms in which the criticism is expressed the associations of one side in a metaphysical controversy.

The vagueness and fluidity of Coleridge's theological opinions have been exaggerated through an illusion, which has arisen from the occasional form in which they have reached us. Criticism, then, has to methodize and focus them. They may be arranged under three heads: the general principles of supernaturalism, orthodox dogmas, the interpretation of Scripture. With regard to the first and second, Coleridge ranks as a Conservative thinker; but his principles of Scriptural interpretation resemble Lessing's; they entitle him to be regarded as the founder of the modern liberal school of English theology. By supernaturalism is meant the theory of a divine person in immediate communication with the human mind, dealing with it out of that order of nature which includes man's body and his ordinary trains of thought, according to fixed laws, which the theologian sums up in the doctrines of "grace" and "sin." Of this supernaturalism, the "Aids to Reflection" attempts to give a metaphysical proof. The first necessity of the argument is to prove that religion, with its supposed experiences of grace and sin, and the realities of a world above the world of sense, is the fulfilment of the constitution of every man, or, in the language of the "philosophy of nature," is part of the "idea" of man; so that when those experiences are absent all the rest of his nature is unexplained, like some enigmatical fragment, the construction and working of which we cannot surmise. According to Schelling's principle, the explanation of every phase of life is to be sought in that next above it. This axiom is applied to three supposed stages of man's reflective life: Prudence, Morality, Religion. Prudence, by which Coleridge means something like Bentham's "enlightened principle of self-preservation," is, he says, an inexplicable instinct, a blind motion in the dark, until it is expanded into morality. Morality, again, is but a groundless prepossession until transformed into a religious recognition of a spiritual world, until, as Coleridge says in his

rich figurative language, "like the main feeder into some majestic lake, rich with hidden springs of its own, it flows into and becomes one with the spiritual life." A spiritual life, then, being the fulfilment of human nature, implied, if we see clearly, in those instincts which enable one to live on from day to day, is part of the "idea" of man.

The second necessity of the argument is to prove that "the idea," according to the principle of the "philosophy of nature," is an infallible index of the actual condition of the world without us. Here Coleridge introduces an analogy:

"In the world, we see everywhere evidences of a unity, which the component parts are so far from explaining, that they necessarily presuppose it as the cause and condition of their existing as those parts, or even of their existing at all. This antecedent unity, or cause and principle of each union, it has, since the time of Bacon and Kepler, been customary to call a law. This crocus for instance; or any other flower the reader may have before his sight, or choose to bring before his fancy; that the root, stem, leaves, petals, &c., cohere to one plant is owing to an antecedent power or principle in the seed which existed before a single particle of the matters that constitute the size and visibility of the crocus had been attracted from the surrounding soil, air, and moisture. Shall we turn to the seed? there, too, the same necessity meets us: an antecedent unity must here, too, be supposed. Analyze the seeds with the finest tools, and let the solar microscope come in aid of your senses, what do you find?—means and instruments; a wondrous fairy tale of nature, magazines of food, stores of various sorts, pipes, spiracles, defences; a house of many chambers, and the owner and inhabitant invisible."—"Aids to Reflection," p. 68.;

Nature, that is, works by what we may call intact ideas. It co-ordinates every part of the crocus to all the other parts; one stage of its growth to the whole process; and having framed its organism to assimilate certain external elements, it does not cheat it of those elements, soil, air, moisture. Well, if the "idea" of man is to be intact, he must be enveloped in a supernatural world; and nature always works by intact ideas. The spiritual life is the highest development of the idea of man; there must be a supernatural world corresponding to it.

One finds, it is hard to say how many, difficulties in drawing Coleridge's conclusion. To mention only one of them—the argument looks too like the exploded doctrine of final causes. Of course the crocus would not live unless the conditions of its life were supplied. The flower is made for soil, air, moisture, and it has them; just as man's senses are made for a sensible world, and we have a sensible world. But give the flower the power of dreaming, nourish it on its own reveries, put man's wild hunger of heart and susceptibility to *ennui* in it, and what indication of the laws of the world without it would be afforded by its longing to break its bonds?

In theology people are content with analogies, probabilities, with the empty schemes of arguments for which the data are still lacking; arguments, the rejection of which Coleridge tells us implies "an evil heart of unbelief," but of which we might as truly say that they derive all their consistency from the peculiar atmosphere of the mind which receives them. Such arguments are received in theology because what chains men to a religion is not its claim on their reason, their hopes or fears, but the glow it affords to the world, its "beau ideal." Coleridge thinks that if we reject the supernatural, the spiritual element in life will evaporate also, that we shall have to accept a life with narrow horizons, without disinterestedness, harshly cut off from the springs of life in the past. But what is this spiritual element? It is the passion for inward perfection with its sorrows, its aspirations, its joy. These mental states are the delicacies of the higher morality of the few, of Augustine, of the author of the "Imitation," of Francis de Sales; in their essence they are only the permanent characteristics of the higher life. Augustine, or the author of the "Imitation," agreeably to the culture of their age, had expressed them in the terms of a metaphysical theory, and expanded them into what theologians call the doctrines of grace and sin, the fluctuations of the union of the soul with its unseen friend. The life of those who are capable of a passion for perfection still produces the same mental states; but that religious expression of them is no longer congruous with the culture of the age. Still, all inward life works itself out in a few simple forms, and culture cannot go very far before the religious graces reappear in it in a subtilized intellectual shape. There are aspects of the religious character which have an artistic worth distinct from their religious import. Longing, a chastened temper, spiritual joy, are precious states of mind, not because they are part of man's duty or because God has commanded them, still less because they are means of obtaining a reward, but because like culture itself they are remote, refined, intense, existing only by the triumph of a few over a dead world of routine in which there is no lifting of the soul at all. If there is no other world, art in its own interest must cherish such characteristics as beautiful spectacles. Stephen's face, "like the face of an angel," has a worth of its own, even if the opened heaven is but a dream.

Our culture, then, is not supreme, our intellectual life is incomplete, we fail of the intellectual throne, if we have no inward longing, inward chastening, inward joy. Religious belief, the craving for objects of belief, may be refined out of our hearts, but they must leave their sacred perfume, their spiritual sweetness, behind. This law of the highest intellectual life has sometimes seemed hard to understand. Those who maintain the claims of the older and narrower forms of religious life against the claims of culture are often embarrassed at finding the intellectual life heated through with the very graces to which they would sacrifice it. How often in the higher class of theological writings—writings which really spring from an original religious genius, such as those of Dr. Newman—does the modern aspirant to perfect culture seems to find the expression of the in-

most delicacies of his own life, the same yet different! The spiritualities of the Christian life have often drawn men on little by little into the broader spiritualities of systems opposed to it—pantheism, or positivism, or a philosophy of indifference. Many in our own generation, through religion, have become dead to religion. How often do we have to look for some feature of the ancient religious life, not in a modern saint, but in a modern artist or philosopher! For those who have passed out of Christianity, perhaps its most precious souvenir is the ideal of a transcendental disinterestedness. Where shall we look for this ideal? In Spinoza; or perhaps in Bentham or in Austin.

Some of those who have wished to save supernaturalism—as, for instance, Theodore Parker—have rejected more or less entirely the dogmas of the Church. Coleridge's instinct is truer than theirs; the two classes of principles are logically connected. It was in defence of the dogmas of the Church that Coleridge elaborated his unhappy crotchet of the diversity of the reason from the understanding. The weakness of these dogmas had ever been not so much a failure of the authority of Scripture or tradition in their favour, as their conflict with reason that they were words rather than conceptions. That analysis of words and conceptions which in modern philosophy has been a principle of continual rejuvenescence with Descartes and Berkeley, as well as with Bacon and Locke, had desolated the field of scholastic theology. It is the rationality of the dogmas of that theology that Coleridge had a taste for proving.

Of course they conflicted with the understanding, with the common daylight of the mind, but then might there not be some mental faculty higher than the understanding? The history of philosophy supplied many authorities for this opinion. Then, according to the "philosophy of nature," science and art are both grounded upon the "ideas" of genius, which are a kind of intuition, which are their own evidence. Again, this philosophy was always saying the ideas of the mind must be true, must correspond to reality; and what an aid to faith is that, if one is not too nice in distinguishing between ideas and mere convictions, or prejudices, or habitual views, or safe opinions! Kant also had made a distinction between the reason and the understanding. True, this harsh division of mental faculties is exactly what is most sterile in Kant, the essential tendency of the German school of thought being to show that the mind always acts *en masse*. Kant had defined two senses of reason as opposed to the understanding. First, there was the "speculative reason," with its "three categories of totality," God, the soul, and the universe—three mental forms which might give a sort of unity to science, but to which no actual intuition corresponded. The tendency of this part of Kant's critique is to destroy the rational groundwork of theism. Then there was the "practical reason," on the relation of which to the "speculative," we may listen to Heinrich Heine:—

"After the tragedy comes the farce. (The tragedy is Kant's destructive criticism of the speculative reason.) So far Immanuel Kant has been playing the relentless philosopher; he has laid siege to heaven." Heine goes on with some violence to describe the havoc Kant has made of the orthodox belief—"Old Lampe,* with the umbrella under his arm, stands looking on much disturbed, perspiration and tears of sorrow running down his cheeks. Then Immanuel Kant grows pitiful, and shows that he is not only a great philosopher but also a good man. He considers a little; and then, half in good nature, half in irony, he says, 'Old Lampe must have a god, otherwise the poor man will not be happy; but man ought to be happy in this life, the practical reason says that; let the practical reason stand surety for the existence of a god; it is all the same to me.' Following this argument, Kant distinguishes between the theoretical and the practical reason, and, with the practical reason for a magic wand, he brings to life the dead body of deism, which the theoretical reason had slain."

Coleridge first confused the speculative reason with the practical, and then exaggerated the variety and the sphere of their combined functions. Then he has given no consistent definition of the reason. It is "the power of universal and necessary convictions;" it is "the knowledge of the laws of the whole considered as one;" it is "the science of all as a whole." Again, the understanding is "the faculty judging according to sense," or "the faculty of means to mediate ends;" and so on. The conception floating in his mind seems to have been a really valuable one; that, namely, of a distinction between an organ of adequate and an organ of inadequate ideas. But when we find him casting about for a definition, not precisely determining the functions of the reason, making long preparations for the "deduction" of the faculty as in the third volume of "The Friend," but never actually starting, we suspect that the reason is a discovery in psychology which Coleridge has a good will to make, and that is all; that he has got no farther than the old vague desire to escape from the limitations of thought by some extraordinary mystical faculty. Some of the clergy eagerly welcomed the supposed discovery. In their difficulties they had often appealed in the old simple way to sentiment and emotion as of higher authority than the understanding, and on the whole had had to get on with very little philosophy. Like M. Jourdain, they were amazed to find that they had been all the time appealing to the reason; now they might actually go out to meet the enemy. Orthodoxy might be cured by a hair of the dog that had bitten it.

Theology is a great house, scored all over with hieroglyphics by perished hands. When we decypher one of those hieroglyphics, we find in it the statement of a mistaken opinion; but knowledge has crept onward since the hand dropped from the wall; we no longer entertain the opinion, and we can trace the origin of the mistake. Dogmas are precious as memorials of a class of sincere and beautiful spirits, who in a past age of humanity struggled with many tears, if not for true knowledge, yet for a noble

* The servant who attended Kant in his walks.

and elevated happiness. That struggle is the substance, the dogma only its shadowy expression; received traditionally in an altered age, it is the shadow of a shadow, a mere τρίτον εἴδωλον, twice removed from substance and reality. The true method then in the treatment of dogmatic theology must be historical. Englishmen are gradually finding out how much that method has done since the beginning of modern criticism by the hands of such writers as Baur. Coleridge had many of the elements of this method: learning, inwardness, a subtle psychology, a dramatic power of sympathy with modes of thought other than his own. Often in carrying out his own method he gives the true historical origin of a dogma, but with a strange dulness of the historical sense, he regards this as a reason for the existence of the dogma now, not merely as reason for its having existed in the past. Those historical elements he could not envisage in the historical method, because this method is only one of the applications, the most fruitful of them all, of the relative spirit.

After Coleridge's death, seven letters of his on the inspiration of Scripture were published, under the title of "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit." This little book has done more than any other of Coleridge's writings to discredit his name with the orthodox. The frequent occurrence in it of the word "bibliolatry," borrowed from Lessing, would sufficiently account for this pious hatred. From bibliolatry Coleridge was saved by the spiritualism, which, in questions less simple than that of the infallibility of Scripture, was so retarding to his culture. Bibliolators may remember that one who committed a kind of intellectual suicide by catching at any appearance of a fixed and absolute authority, never dreamed of resting on the authority of a book. His Schellingistic notion of the possibility of absolute knowledge, of knowing God, of a light within every man which might discover to him the doctrines of Christianity, tended to depreciate historical testimony, perhaps historical realism altogether. Scripture is a legitimate sphere for the understanding. He says, indeed, that there is more in the Bible that "finds" him than he has experienced in all other books put together. But still, "There is a Light higher than all, even the Word that was in the beginning. If between this Word and the written letter I shall anywhere seem to myself to find a discrepance, I will not conclude that such there actually is; nor on the other hand will I fall under the condemnation of them that would lie for God, but seek as I may, be thankful for what I have—and wait." Coleridge is the inaugurator of that *via media* of Scriptural criticism which makes much of saving the word "inspiration," while it attenuates its meaning; which supposes a sort of modified inspiration residing in the whole, not in the several parts. "The Scriptures were not dictated by an infallible intelligence;" nor "the writers each and all divinely informed as well as inspired." "They refer to other documents, and in all points express themselves as sober-minded and veracious writers under ordinary circumstances are known to do." To make the Bible itself "the subject of a special article of faith, is an unnecessary and useless abstraction."

His judgment on the popular view of inspiration is severe. It is borrowed from the Cabbalists; it "petrifies at once the whole body of Holy Writ, with all its harmonies and symmetrical gradations;—turns it at once into a colossal Memnon's head, a hollow passage for a voice, a voice that mocks the voices of many men, and speaks in their names, and yet is but one voice and the same;—and no man uttered it and never in a human heart was it conceived." He presses very hard on the tricks of the "routiniers of desk and pulpit;" forced and fantastic interpretations; "the strange—in all other writings unexampled—practice of bringing together into logical dependency detached sentences from books composed at the distance of centuries, nay, sometimes a millennium, from each other, under different dispensations, and for different objects."

Certainly he is much farther from bibliolatry than from the perfect freedom of the humanist interpreters. Still he has not freed himself from the notion of a sacred canon; he cannot regard the books of Scripture simply as fruits of the human spirit; his criticism is not entirely disinterested. The difficulties he finds are chiefly the supposed immoralities of Scripture; just those difficulties which fade away before the modern or relative spirit, which in the moral world as in the physical traces everywhere change, growth, development. Of historical difficulties, of those deeper moral difficulties which arise for instance from a consideration of the constitutional unveracity of the Oriental mind, he has no suspicion. He thinks that no book of the New Testament was composed so late as A.D. 120.

Coleridge's undeveloped opinions would be hardly worth stating except for the warning they afford against retarding compromises. In reading these letters one never doubts what Coleridge tells us of himself: "that he loved truth with an indescribable awe," or, as he beautifully says, "that he would creep towards the light, even if the light had made its way through a rent in the wall of the temple." And yet there is something sad in reading them by the light which twenty-five years have thrown back upon them. Taken as a whole, they contain a fallacy which a very ardent lover of truth might have detected.

The Bible is not to judge the spirit, but the spirit the Bible. The Bible is to be treated as a literary product. Well, but that is a conditional, not an absolute principle—that is not, if we regard it sincerely, a delivery of judgment, but only a suspension of it. If we are true to the spirit of that, we must wait patiently the complete result of modern criticism. Coleridge states that the authority of Scripture is on its trial—that at present it is not known to be an absolute resting-place; and then, instead of leaving that to aid in the formation of a fearless spirit, the spirit which, for instance, would accept the results of M. Renan's investigations, he turns it into a false security by anticipating the judgment of an undeveloped

criticism. Twenty-five years of that criticism have gone by, and have hardly verified the anticipation.

The man of science asks, Are absolute principles attainable? What are the limits of knowledge? The answer he receives from science itself is not ambiguous. What the moralist asks is, Shall we gain or lose by surrendering human life to the relative spirit? Experience answers, that the dominant tendency of life is to turn ascertained truth into a dead letter—to make us all the phlegmatic servants of routine. The relative spirit, by dwelling constantly on the more fugitive conditions or circumstances of things, breaking through a thousand rough and brutal classifications, and giving elasticity to inflexible principles, begets an intellectual finesse, of which the ethical result is a delicate and tender justness in the criticism of human life. Who would gain more than Coleridge by criticism in such a spirit? We know how his life has appeared when judged by absolute standards. We see him trying to apprehend the absolute, to stereotype one form of faith, to attain, as he says, "fixed principles" in politics, morals, and religion; to fix one mode of life as the essence of life, refusing to see the parts as parts only; and all the time his own pathetic history pleads for a more elastic moral philosophy than his, and cries out against every formula less living and flexible than life itself.

"From his childhood he hungered for eternity." After all, that is the incontestable claim of Coleridge. The perfect flower of any elementary type of life must always be precious to humanity, and Coleridge is the perfect flower of the romantic type. More than Childe Harold, more than Werther, more than René, Coleridge, by what he did, what he was, and what he failed to do, represents that inexhaustible discontent, languor, and home sickness, the chords of which ring all through our modern literature. Criticism may still discuss the claims of classical and romantic art, or literature, or sentiment; and perhaps one day we may come to forget the horizon, with full knowledge to be content with what is here and now; and that is the essence of classical feeling. But by us of the present moment, by us for whom the Greek spirit, with its engaging naturalness, simple, chastened, debonair, τρυφῆς, ἀβρότητος, χλιδῆς, χαρίτων, ἱμέρου, πόθου πατήρ, is itself the Sangraal of an endless pilgrimage, Coleridge, with his passion for the absolute, for something fixed where all is moving, his faintness, his broken memory, his intellectual disquiet, may still be ranked among the interpreters of one of the constituent elements of our life.

Art. V.—Physiological Experiments: Vivisection.

1. *The Beneficent Distribution of the Sense of Pain.* By G. A. Rowell. 2nd Edition. London: Williams and Norgate. 1862.
2. *Report of the British Association for* 1863.

The correspondence which many of our readers will remember to have taken place in 1863 on the subject of physiological experiments upon living animals, or vivisection, as it is commonly called, was remarkable in many particulars. The subject was one the discussion of which was especially well-calculated to bring out into a strong light both the progress which has been made of late years in the general enlightenment of the newspaper-reading classes and also the very considerable amount of ignorant bigotry which still finds place among them.

Soon after that correspondence had been closed, the public was informed, by numerous advertisements, that a valuable prize would be awarded by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, for the best essay upon the subject; and we, in common with other people, awaited the enlightenment which thus appeared to be promised to us. Several months, however, have now passed since the prize was adjudged, yet the successful essay has not yet seen the light; and we therefore recur to the recent edition of Mr. Rowell's clever pamphlet on the sense of pain in animals, for the purpose of offering to our readers some considerations upon physiological experiments involving so-called vivisection. The subject is one of very considerable difficulty. The opinions which have been and still are held upon it vary to the very utmost; and it is a matter in which a person's feelings are apt to be very closely bound up with his opinions. The man of refinement and sensibility finds his whole being stirred to the very utmost with indignation when he hears of what seems to him only the cruel and cold-blooded torture of innocent and gentle creatures. The scientific man, on the other hand, is wont to feel something very like contemptuous impatience when he is told that his best-directed and most laborious efforts to improve the condition of his fellow-men by extending the sphere of their knowledge, are to be checked and thwarted by what is, in his eyes, either mere morbid sentiment, or, at best, an utterly disproportionate valuation of animal life as such. But in this, as in other matters, it is not by insisting on extreme views that any progress can be made towards a real uniformity of opinion. The subject is one in which very complex relations are involved, and which cannot be settled off-hand by sentimental or contemptuous declamation.

In order to impose some limits upon the extent of our investigation, we must begin by the assumption that the destruction of animal life by man for his own food and for other purposes, is necessary, and therefore justifiable—a proposition which may possibly be disputed in the abstract, but which is, at least, irrefragable in so far as regards our own country and our present stage of civilization.

It may be said, indeed, that death and pain are not inseparable; and that a right or a necessity of inflicting one will not imply, even if it be proved to exist, a justification of the infliction of the other; but a very slight consideration of the facts of our social life will suffice to show that no distinction of the kind is observed in practice.

The subject of pain, as it exists among the lower animals, is one upon which it is impossible to doubt but that a vast amount of misconception exists, not among the ignorant only, but also among the refined and highly educated. It is one the investigation of which is very difficult, and leads to results which are matters of inference only, and do not admit of rigid demonstration, and which may seem at first sight to tend towards the encouragement of cruelty rather than its repression. But on this point, as on others, it is well to remember that truth can never be immoral, or, in the long run, even inexpedient. It is certain, however, that in any attempt to estimate the degree to which animals of various grades in creation are sensitive to pain, we must go beyond mere appearances or we shall be grossly misled. What are commonly spoken of as "the ordinary indications of pain" are all of them more or less fallacious. Every surgeon has seen men writhe and heard them groan under operations when he has known well that chloroform had rendered them perfectly insensible before they were begun. We have, many of us, too, seen persons afflicted with epilepsy writhe and wriggle apparently in the extremest agony; but yet there is evidence in plenty, that however distressing a disease epilepsy may be, from its effects upon both body and mind, almost the first step in the train of phenomena which constitute a fit or convulsion, is the complete loss of consciousness, and all the subsequent contortions are performed without pain, or even sensation, on the part of the sufferer.

Our readers will find this subject followed out with equal thoughtfulness and ingenuity and at greater length than we have space to pursue it here, in the essay the title of which stands at the head of this article. In this essay Mr. Rowell argues, with a force which must carry conviction to the mind of any unprejudiced person, that the sense of pain, even in the most highly-organized animals, is very much lower in intensity than it is in man; and that in many of the lower creatures it can scarcely exist at all. He shows further, that the acknowledgment of this truth, so far from affording any encouragement to cruelty, only enables us to form a more correct notion of what cruelty really is, and would, if it became general, lead to a great improvement in the relations between man and the lower animals. Thus, for instance, Mr. Rowell shows that there is good reason for believing that hunger, even when not felt in an extreme degree, is a source of more uneasiness to an animal so highly organised even as the horse than is a severe bodily injury. He quotes several cases—pp. 22, 23—in which horses have met with accidents on the road of such severity that their leg bones have been found producing through the skin, and actually in contact with the ground, as they walked along; yet in all these cases the animals began to graze, standing on their wounded extremities, almost as soon as they were left to themselves. Now, it is not pretended that under such circumstances as these the creatures feel *no* pain at all; but it may very reasonably be argued that the degree of pain which they do feel must be almost immeasurably short of what a human being endures in a similar case. We do not generally see a man sit quietly down to dinner within half an hour after his leg has been crushed by a waggon—even although he may not have to stand upon the wounded limb while he eats it. It will be doubtless a new idea to many a man who fancies himself humane, that if he keeps a horse upon a short allowance of food, there is at least some reason to fear that he inflicts more misery upon the animal than does the cab-driver whom he has himself perhaps threatened with prosecution for cruelly flogging his horse. Nevertheless, it is clear that the consideration of this probability will tend rather to induce the humane man to see that his horse gets enough to eat than to encourage the cab-driver in the habit of brutal flogging. This is but one among innumerable instances which might be given in order to demonstrate the truth of the proposition which we are now discussing. That the proposition itself is an unpopular one we are fully aware; but if it happens to be true, its admission will be followed, and can be followed, by no ill result, but only by a good one. The distinction between that which is true and that which is edifying, is one which the English public has not yet learned to appreciate. We will mention but two more facts in support of this view. It occurs not unfrequently to fly-fishers to take a salmon or other fish, which has already one or more hooks fastened in its jaw, but which does not seem to have suffered in health or condition in consequence; yet compare with this the effect of any injury of similar magnitude upon a human being, and the contrast will be striking enough. Another instance, even more to our present purpose, is to be found in the different effects of similar surgical operations, when performed on the lower animals or on the human subject. Thus it is a well-known fact that any operation upon the human subject which entails the opening of the cavity of the peritoneum is attended with the most serious danger. Inflammation of that membrane is very commonly the result, and is a most dangerous affection. In the dog, on the contrary, and in other animals, the same membrane may be cut into with comparatively little fear of any such result; yet it would trouble any physiologist to assign an intelligible reason for this difference, unless it is to be found in the immeasurably greater susceptibility of the nervous system in man than in the lower animals.

The proposition, then, that the animal creation, not excepting even its higher classes, is immensely less sensitive to pain than is mankind, is one which we believe will not admit of serious dispute; but it is worthy of notice in this connection that the degree of sensibility to pain even in mankind varies directly with the increase of civilization, and that to a degree which superficial observers will not be very ready to admit. It would be easy to bring forward a number of facts in proof of this, were it needful; but one will suffice for the present. Mr. Palgrave, in his recent work upon Arabia, gives the following instance of extreme

insensibility to pain in the case of a young Arab:—

"What is really remarkable among them (the Arabs) is a great obtuseness in the general nervous sensibility. On more than one occasion I had to employ the knife or caustic, and was surprised at the patient's cool endurance. While at Riad, a young fellow presented himself with a bullet lodged deep in the forearm; it gave him some annoyance, and he insisted on having it cut out. The operation was, for my inexpertness, a difficult one; the muscular fascia had to be divided down to the bone. Meanwhile the Nejdean held out the limb steady and inflexible, as though it belonged to a third party, and never changed colour, except it were a flush of excited pleasure on his face when I finally drew out the ball through the incision and placed it in his hand. After a short interval of bandaging and repose he got up and walked home, carrying his leaden trophy along with him. Much similar I saw and heard; the Arabs are not a nervous or excitable race."

The questions hitherto considered and the principles laid down do but clear the way for a right view of the two propositions which it is our proper business to discuss. They do not pretend to do more than this, for since there can be no doubt that animal life is of high value, as we may learn from the many contrivances existing in nature for its preservation, and since, too, in depriving any animal of life we are taking away that which we can never restore, it follows clearly enough that we can have no right to do so wantonly. Since, too, no one in his senses can doubt that all the higher classes of animals possess some degree of feeling, however much it may be below the standard attained by man, we can find no justification for torturing an animal which possesses any sensation on the grounds that it feels but little, any more than a pickpocket can defend his robbery of a five-pound note from a millionaire on the score that the latter has so many such that he will never feel the loss. But the real force of this preliminary discussion is simply this: that whereas it is as much a crime to sit idly by and permit an evil which it is within a man's power to prevent as to become oneself the agent in the mischief; so it becomes necessary in certain cases for a man to consider whether by the artificial production of suffering and death in animals he may ward off similar suffering and death from men: and inasmuch as we are clearly of opinion that men are "of more value than many sparrows," it seems to follow that surgeons and physiologists are not only justified, but positively bound to inflict suffering upon the lower animals, IF it can be shown that it is necessary or greatly advantageous so to do for the purpose of saving human life or mitigating human suffering. If a man conscientiously believes that he can by a certain course of vivisection obtain the means of curing a disease hitherto intractable, or of materially improving upon the treatment of one as at present practised, we do not scruple to say that he neglects his duty if he neglects to perform such vivisections. For what such a man does is really to set a higher value on a few dogs or rabbits than on an indefinite number of his fellow-men. Does any reasonable man, for instance, doubt that he may lawfully ride a horse to death to save a human life, whether his own or another's? But those who deny that vivisection can in any case be justified should hold, in order to be consistent, that an aid-de-camp is to consider the life and suffering of his horse when the safety of a whole army depends upon the rapidity with which he delivers his despatches.

From the considerations thus far adduced, it would appear that in attempting to form a judgment as to the justifiable character of vivisections, we must be guided by the following general principles: viz., that while wanton cruelty can in no case be excusable, on the other hand that suffering, and even very severe suffering, not only may be, but must be, inflicted upon the lower animals, where any adequate benefit is thereby to be secured for mankind, or any considerable evil to be averted from them. To these two principles a third must also be added: viz., that in judging of all matters of the kind regard must be had to the existing grade of civilization; that is to say, we must take into consideration the habits of society as it exists around us, in order that we may not attempt to begin reforms, necessary or desirable in themselves, at the wrong end of our social system.

It may be well, perhaps, before proceeding to the consideration of the necessity or otherwise of vivisection for the general progress of physiological science, to say a few words as to the other purpose for which its utility has been alleged, that, viz., of giving skill to the operator. This portion of the subject is, however, one which need not detain us long. Our readers will doubtless remember that it was in connection with this question that the whole newspaper discussion upon vivisection arose. It was in consequence of the habitual use of vivisection in the French veterinary schools that the agitation of the question was begun, and their sole and avowed purpose in so employing it was that of rendering their students skilful operators, and, by accustoming them to retain their coolness in the presence of animals struggling under torture, to enable them to avoid accidents in the course of their subsequent practice. Now, without following the French professors through the whole course of an ingenious but not very convincing defence of their practices made before the Imperial Academy of Medicine, we may be permitted to remark that the superiority of their veterinarians as operators to those of other countries, where such a course of education happily neither is nor is likely to be tolerated, is a matter which it requires more than the mere *ipse dixit* of the said professors to establish. It is, moreover, not very obvious that the good to be effected by extra skill in the performance of veterinary operations is at all commensurate with the evil of the demoralization which cannot but be produced in ignorant or ill-educated persons by the mere fact of habitual vivisection. It can be but a money advantage, and that, considering the small number of horses which require to undergo severe operations, but a very

slight one. With regard to the question of accidents, it may be sufficient to remark, that where they occur in veterinary practice it is quite as likely that the victim should be one of the grooms, stable-boys, or idlers who serve as temporary assistants to the veterinarian, as that functionary himself; and hence, unless all these persons are also to be practically instructed in the art of "maintaining their composure throughout the struggles of tortured animals," the art itself will be found to go very little way in the prevention of accidents. On the whole, we cannot think that any case has been made out in defence of habitual vivisection for the purpose of imparting operative skill. That the very highest degree of skill can be attained without its aid the present position of English surgery will suffice to show; and the course of instruction which is enough to produce that skill in human surgery might surely suffice for the veterinary art as well; and a trifling amount of additional dexterity is attained—if indeed it be at last attained—at too great a sacrifice, when it gives rise to the amount of animal suffering which was formerly the case in the victims at Alfort and elsewhere, and to the degree of brutalization among the students which cannot but be inseparable from its habitual and therefore familiar and thoughtless infliction.

If we come now to the more interesting and far more important question of the relation of vivisection to the general progress of physiology, we shall find that the opinions of men of science are much divided. One school of physiologists sets up vivisection as the one great means for the investigation of biological facts, and have accordingly employed it extensively and remorselessly; another school bases its hopes of the progress of the science almost exclusively upon anatomical and chemical investigation, and holds vivisection accordingly to be almost as useless as it is repulsive. A very few instances, taken from the history of science, will probably do more than a volume of argumentation to place the matter in its proper light. In entering upon this portion of the subject, however, we must guard against a misconception into which the use of the word "vivisection" is not unlikely to betray the reader. The word, if strictly used, means, of course, the dissection of animals during life; but it is hardly necessary to say that, for the purposes of our present argument, as well as indeed of every discussion upon the subject, its meaning must be extended so far as to include all experiments upon living animals which are of a kind calculated to inflict pain upon them. It would be absurd to raise an objection to the infliction of a wound, however slight, and to justify the administration of an irritant poison, which is capable of inflicting the most frightful torments. This very subject, then, of the administration of poisons and of medicines (for no line of demarcation can be drawn between them) to animals, for the purpose of learning their effects upon mankind, is the first to which we will call attention in relation to the matter now in hand. The objects with which drugs are administered to animals are two: viz., either to ascertain whether any particular drug is capable of destroying animal life, and if so, in what manner; or, secondly, to learn whether a reputed remedial agent has any definite physiological action, and how that action is modified by its administration in different quantities or combinations. Of the second of these objects it is needless here to speak; but the first, as is well known, is pursued not only with the view of advancing Toxicology as a branch of science, but, on certain very important occasions, for purposes of legal inquiry also; and our present business is to determine whether, in these cases, experiment upon animals is capable of affording indispensable or valuable information.

Professor Taylor, who is by no means disposed to over-value evidence derived from physiological experiments, and who agrees with other modern authorities in the opinion that its importance has been exaggerated, uses nevertheless the following language concerning it:—

"There is, however, one instance* where evidence from experiments upon animals cautiously performed may be of some importance on a criminal trial. I allude to the case in which a poisonous substance is not of a nature readily to admit of a chemical analysis, as, for example, in substances belonging to the neurotic class of poisons. . . . In the case of Reg. *v.* Dove (York Autumn Assizes, 1856,) the proof of the presence of strychnia in the stomach of the deceased was partly based on the effect produced on animals by a prepared extract of the contents. A sufficient quantity was procured to kill several animals under the usual tetanic symptoms produced by the poison. This evidence was conclusive, and more satisfactory than the application of chemical tests to extracts of organic matter containing the poison."

And again on the very next page:—

"A woman named Sherrington was tried at the Liverpool Spring Assizes, in 1838, for the attempt to administer poison to one Mary Byres. The evidence showed that the prisoner had sent to the prosecutrix a pudding by two young children. On the way the children tasted it, and finding that it had an unpleasant taste, the prosecutrix was put on her guard. The pudding was sent to a surgeon to be analysed, but he could detect no poison in it. He suspected, however, that it contained a vegetable narcotic poison. He gave a piece about the size of an egg to a dog. In twenty minutes the dog became sick, in forty minutes it lost the use of its limbs, and died in three hours. The prisoner was convicted. Cases in which evidence of this kind, accidentally obtained, has been made available on charges of criminal poisoning, are now very numerous."

Now, in the former of these cases, it is clear that had physiological experiments been deemed unlawful, one of the most atrocious criminals that was ever brought to trial would have escaped scot-free, and might have continued his course of crime to this day. Yet, here, *several* animals were sacrificed, and that under circum-

* "Treatise on Poisons," p. 211. Second edition. Churchill: 1859. It is evident from the context that the learned professor means here one "class of instances."

stances of torment which can scarcely be over-estimated. It is obvious, also, that in the case of the discovery or the first use for criminal purposes of any new poison, we could never become thoroughly acquainted with its nature, so as to be able either to detect crime or to remedy accidental poisoning, unless a course of experiments upon animals formed a part of our investigation into its properties.

It may, perhaps, be maintained that means may justifiably be used for the purpose of judicial investigation, involving the issues of life and death, which no less important matters would excuse; and, therefore, it is necessary to go further than thus showing that, for judicial purposes, physiological experiments are indispensable, and to prove that they are also necessary for the progress of science, and through its means for the relief of human suffering. For this purpose we will proceed to examine only a single point in the history of our knowledge of the physiology of the nervous system. The progress of knowledge in this branch of physiology, has been so great since the days of Unzer and Prochaska, as to leave no doubt in the mind of any one acquainted with its history, that it is on the side of physiology, much more than that of empiricism, that we both have attained to our present improved practice in many of the most fearful forms of disease that afflict humanity, and that we may expect hereafter to treat them with still greater success.

It can hardly be necessary to insist, in the year 1865, upon the importance of the study of physiology as a branch of science. It is acknowledged on all hands, and has obtained such a hold upon the minds of the educated classes, that within the last few years the force of public opinion alone has compelled the Universities to admit this science to a place in their ordinary course of studies; and in the science of physiology the study of the nervous system must always hold the very foremost place. Now, beyond all controversy, the physiologist to whom we owe the most decided advance that has ever been made in this study is the late Sir Charles Bell. He it was who first demonstrated the distinct motor and sensory roots of the spinal nerves, and by a brilliant series of discoveries led the way to the present position of our knowledge of the nervous system. Accordingly, in a letter published in the *Times* of August 13, 1863, the testimony of Sir Charles Bell is quoted as decisive of the fact that nothing is ever learned by vivisection. The words as cited are—

"In a foreign review of my former papers the results have been considered in favour of experiments (on living animals). They are, on the contrary, deductions from anatomy; and *I have had recourse to experiments, not to form my opinions, but to impress them on others. It must be my apology that my utmost powers of persuasion were lost while I urged my statements on the ground of observation alone.*"

And again—

"Anatomy is already looked on with prejudice; let not its professors unnecessarily incur the censures of the humane. *Experiments (vivisections) have never been the means of discovery;* and the survey of what has been attempted of late years will prove that the opening of living animals has done more to perpetuate error than to enforce the just views taken from anatomy and the natural motions."

The italics are our own. Most unfortunately, the reference to the portion of Sir C. Bell's works from which this extract is taken is not given in the letter, and we have not been fortunate enough to meet with it; consequently, we do not know the date or the occasion upon which these remarks were written. Probably, however, they had reference to the attempts which were made by some Continental physiologists to subvert Bell's conclusions by means of a series of experimental vivisections. However this may be, there is evidence enough elsewhere in Bell's works both of his humane reluctance to employ vivisection and also of the fact that he felt himself compelled to resort to it, and did resort to it frequently. Thus, for example, in a general view of the nervous system prefixed to the third edition of his collected memoirs,* he states, in explaining his great discovery of the separate functions of the roots of the spinal nerves—

"It was necessary to know whether the phenomena exhibited on injuring the separate roots of the spinal nerves corresponded with what was suggested by their anatomy. After refraining long, on account of the unpleasant nature of the operation, I at last opened the spinal canal of a rabbit, and cut the posterior roots of the nerves of the lower extremities," &c.

He goes on to state how the protracted cruelty of the dissection deterred him from repeating the experiment, and how he reflected that an animal recently stunned would serve his purpose. Similarly Sir C. Bell speaks afterwards of cutting across the fifth nerve and the seventh nerve on the face of an ass (p. 26). Again, at pp. 52-3, may be found an elaborate account of some experiments on the facial nerves of the ass; indeed, the whole of this paper, presented to the Royal Society in 1821, is full of vivisectional experiments—asses, dogs, monkeys, being all pressed into the unwelcome service. Again, in the paper on the motions of the eye, there is contained a whole section entitled "Experimental Inquiry into the Action of these Muscles,"† *i.e.*, muscles of the eye, which is, as its name implies, occupied mainly with a detail of the results produced by experiments on living animals.

It is thus sufficiently evident that Sir C. Bell had recourse not unfrequently to experiments upon animals, and these, too, of a very painful nature; and we are persuaded, moreover, that an unprejudiced consideration even of the passage above cited, as proving his low opinion of experiment as a means of discovery, will show that it bears a somewhat different interpretation. In the first place, the passage taken as it stands, has somewhat the air of being written by a philosopher standing in some sort on his defence

* "Nervous System of the Human Body," pp. 24-5. Renshaw: 1844.

† Op. cit. p. 156, *et seq.*

against a charge which, if admitted, might endanger the popularity of his doctrines; he speaks, for instance, of "anatomy" as being "looked on with prejudice," just as any man might do who, in a generation less enlightened than our own, stood in awe of the babble of a half-educated society, which was ready enough to twit the medical profession with ignorance and slowness of progress, while it would, in deference to an ignorant sentimentalism, deny to its members the only practicable means of acquiring extended and accurate knowledge. Moreover, it is to be observed, that in this apology, as he calls it, for his experiments, Sir C. Bell gives a reason for their performance which, in point of fact, amounts to the assertion that they were absolutely necessary in the case of his own discoveries, and will be so in those of other physiologists. He states that he found himself unable, except by their aid, to prove his deductions from anatomy to the satisfaction of other minds; and what, we may ask, is the value of a discovery unless it can be made plain to others besides the discoverer? And yet, in the case before us, it is clear to the most limited intelligence, that by experiment alone could Bell's deductions from anatomy be proved. He had examined the spinal cord, and he found two distinct roots to each nerve, and these roots entering the spinal cord in two distinct places. The nerves themselves, too, having two distinct endowments, those of sensation and motion. He felt no doubt, that of the two roots each subserved one of these faculties. But such a conclusion as this could never have been raised above the region of mere hypothesis otherwise than by experiment. It was open to any other anatomist to maintain any other imaginable view as to the functions of the two roots; as, for instance, that they were intended by nature merely as a measure of precaution, that in case of the destruction of one, the powers of the nerve trunk might still be exercised by means of the other; or that one root was intended to exercise an influence upon the nutrition of the nerve itself, while its special powers resided in the other, or any other hypothesis of the kind. But when the experiment had been tried, when it had been shown that upon dividing the anterior roots of the nerves of a limb in a living animal, its power of motion was lost while the capacity of sensation remained, and *vice versâ;* when these had been repeated upon several different animals, always with the same result, then, and not till then, the discovery became a real discovery; thus, and thus alone was made the greatest advance in our knowledge of physiology which has been achieved since the days of Harvey. But the history of physiology will carry us yet one step further in this matter. Bell, as we have seen, was sparing of experiment, and delighted in deductions from that minute and careful anatomical investigation of which he was so great a master. He found that he could trace all the anterior or motor roots of the spinal nerves into a distinct double tract of nerve-matter forming the front portion of the spinal cord, and well known to anatomists as its "anterior columns," and the posterior or sensory roots, similarly into the middle or lateral columns of the spinal cord. These columns he traced up into the brain, and concluded that the anterior ones were the channels of motor power, or of the orders of the will, so to speak, and the lateral the channels by which sensory impressions are conveyed to the brain itself. Now, more legitimate deductions from anatomy than these two it is not easy to conceive. It was admitted on all hands that in the brain is the seat of sensation and of volition; it was proved to demonstration that the anterior nerve-roots subserve the purposes of voluntary motion, and the posterior those of sensation, and the anterior and middle columns of the cord seemed to supply the exact link wanting to complete the chain of evidence, and to enable us approximately to comprehend the marvellous apparatus by which our minds are brought into relation with the external world around us.

It is to be noted, however, before proceeding further, that the view of the connection of the nerve roots with the cord and through it with the brain, which we have just described as being held by Sir Charles Bell, was only that at which he finally arrived. He had previously believed that the posterior roots of the nerves were connected, not with the middle columns of the spinal cord, but with another distinct tract of nerve-matter called the posterior columns. This opinion was afterwards maintained by the distinguished French physiologist M. Longet, and, what is somewhat remarkable, continued to be popularly represented as the theory of Sir Charles Bell long after he had himself given it up in favour of that above described.

The fact, then, that different physiologists were thus at variance upon a point of anatomical fact, viz., whether the posterior roots of the spinal nerves are connected with the posterior or with the lateral columns of the spinal cord, is of itself sufficient to show that anatomy alone is quite incompetent of itself to lead us to satisfactory conclusions in regard to the physiology of the nervous system; and this becomes all the more obvious when we discover, as we pursue the history of this branch of science, that later and more minute observers, such as Stilling, Lockhart-Clarke, and Schroeder Van der Kolk, have ascertained that the posterior nerve roots are not directly connected with either of these parts of the spinal cord, but with another portion, viz., the grey-coloured nerve-matter which exists in the centre of all the columns. The whole question of their connection is, in truth, one of extreme difficulty and intricacy, and is yet far from being satisfactorily solved; and did we depend upon anatomy alone for our knowledge of nervous physiology, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that there would have been till very recently almost as much to be said for any one of the three views now enumerated as for any other. But exactly at the point at which anatomy becomes helpless vivisection steps in, and in a very great degree clears up the difficulty. There is certainly no living physiologist, probably none since the days of Bell himself, to whom this branch of science is so deeply indebted as to Dr. Brown-Séquard. Yet

it is as an experimenter—a vivisector, if you will, that he is chiefly known to fame. He has shown conclusively, amongst other facts most important to the advancement of physiological science, that the views of Bell and Longet upon the subject of the course of sensory impressions in the spinal cord, are alike untenable, and that they in reality pass from the posterior roots to the brain itself, mainly by the instrumentality of the grey matter of the spinal cord. This he has done chiefly by means of an extensive series of experiments upon living animals.*

It is quite true, indeed, that Dr. Brown-Séquard's conclusions are not based upon experiment alone; they derive important support from a careful record of cases of disease, of which the symptoms were accurately observed during life, and the morbid appearances noted after death; but it is by means of the experiments alone that the diseases could be interpreted. Cases of disease have been occurring and being recorded for generations and centuries, but they could not, and as a matter of fact have not, led us to the point at which we now stand in our knowledge of physiology. Those who are familiar with the symptoms of disease and with the traces which it leaves upon the body after death, know only too well the disproportion which exists between them, and feel only too keenly the necessity which exists for a knowledge of physiology—a knowledge, that is, of the natural functions as well as natural structures of the organs in health, as the only possible foundation for a rational knowledge of disease, and for that scientific treatment of it to which it is the object of all but mere empirics ultimately to attain. We have been compelled, in the discussion of this portion of our subject, to enter into somewhat more technical details than we could have wished; but this was rendered necessary, in order to demonstrate, not from any merely theoretical instance, but from actual facts in the recent history of science, a proposition which we believe is admitted by almost every one who is practically acquainted with physiology and in any way engaged in advancing its boundaries, viz., this: that there are three different methods by which physiological knowledge can be pursued, viz., by anatomical and chemical investigation, by observation of diseases, and by physiological experiment; and that, in so complicated and difficult a science, we cannot afford to discard any one of these methods; on the contrary, we can only hope for any considerable advance by persistently working at all the three; and it is only in those cases in which discoveries arrived at by one method are corroborated by evidence afforded by the others that real and substantial advances have been made. We have thus seen that there are certain instances, at least, in which science has attained to its present position partly by the help of vivisection, and in which it is not easy to see how it could have done so without that help. It is obvious that legal investigations in cases of poisoning could not be properly conducted without experiments upon animals; and in regard to Sir C. Bell's discoveries in the physiology of the nervous system, it has been shown, (1) that they could not have been proved without experiment; (2) that certain errors into which their discoverer fell were due to his very sparing use of vivisection; and (3) that later physiologists have been enabled to correct these very errors, because they have not been equally sparing in its use. It is needless to multiply examples, or we might cite further cases referred to by Professor Rolleston in his address to the Physiological Subsection of the British Association, delivered at the meeting of 1863; of the researches of Drs. Brown-Séquard, Pavy, and M'Donald, upon the subject of epilepsy and diabetes, as showing how in certain instances the knowledge gained by vivisection can be applied directly to the benefit of the human race. These diseases are two of the most terrible evils which afflict humanity, and anything which enables us to combat them to advantage is no mere addition to theoretical knowledge, but a relief of the direst and most hopeless forms of human misery, and so far surely worth the infliction of some amount of pain upon the lower creatures.

"Vivisection," says Professor Rolleston, "produces a certain amount of pain; but in this pain, voluntarily and of deliberate purpose produced is a few laboratories, greater in amount, in intensity, in duration, than the mental pain, moral distress, and bodily agony endured in many a cottage and many a palace by the victims of the very two diseases which in these last years vivisection has most assisted medicine to combat?" *

We arrive thus, however unwillingly, at the conclusion that vivisection *is* necessary for the general purposes of science; and if, as we most undoubtingly believe, the advancement of science, and more especially of physiology, is of very great importance to the interests of mankind, it follows that vivisection must be permitted to go on. It is doubtless a sorry necessity, but not on that account to be ignored.

We come, in the next place, to speak of the limitations under which vivisection should be carried on, and the means which are to be used to mitigate its severities; and in so doing, we hope to be able both to meet some of the objections commonly made to its practice, and to clear up some of the misconceptions which are current upon the subject. And here, we cannot probably better convey what we believe to be the true and the really humane doctrine upon this matter, than by adopting the sentiments expressed by Professor Rolleston in his address above referred to. The Professor thereť reminds his hearers, firstly, that in a large number of vivisections, the very first step of the experiment destroys the life of the animal, and that more quickly and less painfully than is the case where animals are killed by the butcher or the sportsman; and, secondly, that where such is not the case, in a very large number of instances chloroform, or some other anæsthetic, can be

* See his Lect. on Phys. &c., of Nervous System, delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, 1858.

* "Newcastle Daily Chronicle," Friday, Aug. 28, 1863.

† See "Report of British Association for 1863," p. 110.

and is employed, and the pain of the operation thus avoided. The cases, therefore, in which really painful vivisection is necessary for the advancement of science are thus reduced to a minimum, and consist almost exclusively of those in which the subject-matter of the investigation is the physiology of the nervous system. In these instances, such experiments are, as we have shown, sometimes indispensable; but we will proceed further to show that such cases arise but comparatively seldom, and ought to be restricted within very narrow limits. There is a sense in which the words above quoted from Sir Charles Bell, that "experiment or vivisection has never been the means of discovery," are quite indisputable, and it is, we think, this sense which he must have intended to convey, viz., that the only fitting use of vivisection is for the purpose of proof and confirmation of a discovery otherwise arrived at; and that it is no more scientifically reasonable than it is morally justifiable to perform a number of experiments upon animals without a sufficient guide derived from previous investigation, and, in fact, without a clear and definite end in view. For instance, if Sir C. Bell himself had *begun* his investigations with vivisection, he would never in all probability have made the discoveries which raised him to the very first rank amongst physiologists. In so complicated and delicate a piece of mechanism as the animal body, one, too, in which the separate parts are so dependent upon each other and upon the harmonious action of the whole, for the power of duly performing their own offices, it is in the highest degree unreasonable to attempt to remove one organ or set of organs in order to learn, by the effect of such removal, what the functions of those organs are, until, by a long and careful course of observation during the action of the machine (*i.e.*, during life), and of examination of the parts when inactive (*i.e.*, after death), the experimenter has learned as far as possible what are the relations of the parts which he proposes to remove to the other parts, and to the organism as a whole.

Again, it may be further safely asserted, and in this we know that we are but repeating the opinion of distinguished living physiologists, that the work of vivisection in the matter, at any rate of the nervous system, is in great part already completed. We know now, thanks to the labours of a few great discoverers, the cardinal points in nervous physiology, and beyond such points it may well be doubted whether vivisection can ever carry us. Even the most skilful operator can never be sure of the exact distance to which his knife penetrates, and the extent and violence of the operation required before the brain or the spinal column of a living animal can be brought within reach of the knife at all is such as utterly to do away with anything like minute accuracy of experiment.* Even Dr. Brown-Séquard, himself the very prince of experimenters, says on this subject:—

"I must say that it is impossible to know *while* we make a section of parts of the spinal cord what is the precise depth of the injury; it is mere guess-work. But if we study well the phenomena, and then, after having killed the animal, if we put the spinal cord in alcohol we render it hard, and we can ascertain what is the extent of the incision."

By minute we mean therefore microscopical accuracy, and we repeat that it is impossible by vivisectional experiment to know which microscopical elements of the nervous tissues of the animal we destroy. But any one who is acquainted with the present position of physiology is aware that it is upon questions of the minute structure and arrangement of the elements of the nervous tissues that the points most in dispute amongst physiologists now rest, questions therefore which it is quite beyond the province of vivisection to decide. Hence experiments of a really painful character can be required only in exceptional cases, and need be performed, indeed can be properly performed, only by experienced physiologists engaged in original researches designed to extend the boundaries of their science. It is true, indeed, that a question may be and has been raised, as to how far it is necessary or expedient to demonstrate to students the main facts in the physiology of the nervous system by means of vivisection. To this question we have no hesitation in answering that such a proceeding is in no case necessary, and therefore in no case justifiable. Those facts could, no doubt, as we have shown above, be originally proved to the satisfaction of physiologists only by means of vivisection, but when they have become admitted and received, there is no need to prove them over and over again to every successive class of students. It is true that the sight of some of the effects—for instance, of a section of some part of the spinal cord in a living animal—is likely to impress the physiology of that organ upon a student's mind much more forcibly than is the mere dissection of it after death, and the reading or being lectured upon the functions of its different parts; but there does not seem to be any reason why it should be necessary to bring this particular portion of physiology directly under his eyes any more than many others, which, as a fact, nobody ever attempts to demonstrate to students in a similar way—such, for instance, as the functions of the kidneys or the salivary glands. It is indeed very much less necessary, inasmuch as but few students can carefully attend on the practice of a large hospital for a single year without seeing cases of disease or injury which will serve the purpose of demonstration perfectly well. Such cases might be, as we have said above, quite insufficient to establish any physiological doctrine not otherwise demonstrated, and yet suffice perfectly to illustrate it when once proved and admitted. If experiments could be performed without pain to their subjects, it might be the teacher's duty to perform them before his class; but since such is not the case, the mere purpose of proving to students doctrines which it is their business as students not to judge of, but rather to learn and understand, and which can be perfectly well understood without any such experiments, cannot be considered an adequate reason for their performance. But there is a further reason also why experiments should not be performed for the instruction of classes of medical

* Op. cit. p. 42, note.

students. As a rule, they require not only great skill on the part of their performer, but also a large expenditure of patience and of time; though there is about them a certain degree of morbid excitement, they are, as a rule, both repulsive and tedious. A course of physiological lectures, if illustrated by means of experiments, would certainly occupy much more time than one not so illustrated, and the requirements now made of medical students during their three or four years' course of professional study are such that any additional calls upon their time, especially for the purposes of those subjects which are but indirectly useful to them in their future practice, is very much to be deprecated. It is quite impossible, and happily quite unnecessary, to make the great body of medical practitioners accomplished physiologists, and no one who does not aspire to become an accomplished physiologist has any need whatever either to perform or to witness vivisection. And it is hardly necessary to say, that when either performed or witnessed without necessity, they are entirely without advantage, and do but tend to demoralize those who are engaged in them. In speaking thus, we do not intend to confine the remark to experiments on the nervous system. For though it is true that these only are necessarily painful, yet the fact of witnessing such vivisections as only apparently give pain can have nothing but an ill effect upon the mind of the spectators, unless they be performed for a good and sufficient purpose, and one, moreover, in the prosecution of which all the persons engaged are thoroughly in earnest. We may find here a reason why there is a wide distinction between the performance of vivisection by a physiologist in his laboratory, with merely the one or two assistants who may be necessary, and who will be in most cases persons themselves engaged in similar investigations, and their performance by a professor for the instruction of his class; in the former case, all the persons concerned are thoroughly in earnest, they are engaged in their business, and, in fact, their duty; in the latter, however intent on labour and duty the professor himself may be, a large proportion of his class will be the merest dilettanti, and the effect upon their minds will be about as elevating as is that of witnessing an execution upon those who habitually attend such spectacles.

We must conclude, then, upon a review of the whole question, that vivisections are not justifiable for the mere instruction of ordinary students; that they should be performed only by accomplished physiologists; that when performed by them they need be of a painful character only when the nervous system is the subject of investigation; and finally, that, even in this last case, in the present position of physiological science, vivisections are but very seldom necessary. It thus becomes clear that the limits within which vivisection ought to be permitted are the narrowest possible; and it remains to consider only what means should be used in order to restrain its practice within those limits. Now, in this country and at the present time, there are two means by which the actions of individuals are restrained within the boundaries necessary for the preservation of public morality: one is law as expressed in Acts of Parliament; the other is that unwritten law, which is of greater force than any Act of Parliament, and which has power in regions which no Act of Parliament can reach, viz., enlightened public opinion. We do not hesitate to say that it is to the latter that we must look for the enforcement of a due moderation in the matter now before us. This might probably be shown without even taking into consideration the intense antipathy entertained by most Englishmen towards over legislation in all forms. Yet this is not a consideration to be overlooked. Let any one consider the number and magnitude of the evils which this very antipathy persuades Englishmen to endure, and he will be able to judge in some measure how formidable an obstacle it would place in the way of any legislation which should propose to hamper in any way the actions of scientific men in the pursuit of knowledge. If Englishmen are unwilling, as they undoubtedly are, to interfere by legislation with the liberty of the subject to perform actions which can admit of no defence of any kind, much more are they likely to decline to interfere with the liberty of a small class of men, whose actions, whether good or not, are at least capable of apology, and are not thrust obtrusively before the public eye. But quite apart from the general dislike of meddling legislation, there is among all classes in this country, and more particularly among the better educated of the middle classes, a strong special feeling in favour of the prosecution of physical science, and against any interference with its professors. If there is any one thing in which the mass of educated, and even half-educated, Englishmen undoubtingly believe, it is the connection of their material prosperity with the progress of science, and though many of them have scarcely shaken off the old mediæval horror of anatomy and anatomists, yet they would, we believe, be very slow to put any new obstacle in the way even of these unpopular branches of knowledge. The lessons, moreover, of history are not entirely thrown away; and one of these lessons most undoubtedly is the utter futility, as well as the impolicy, of putting legislative restraints upon the progress of knowledge. If we except, perhaps, the last half century, it may well be doubted whether the study of anatomy was ever so enthusiastically pursued as in times when its cultivation was attended with positive personal danger; and in days, which some now alive may remember, the necessity of "body-snatching," as it was vulgarly called, stimulated, much more than it hindered, the practice of *post-mortem* examinations. How greatly the feeling of the masses on such subjects has changed of late years is well known to medical men, to most of whom it has no doubt happened, as in several instances which have come under our own knowledge, that after the fatal termination of an uncommon case of disease, even among working people, the first suggestion that the body should be examined has come from the friends of the deceased.

In the earlier part of this paper, we have

laid it down as a principle to be observed in judging of the questions before us, that we must take into our consideration the grade of existing civilization, that is to say, the general habits of society, as they respect the relation subsisting between man and the lower animals; and with a few remarks upon this subject, as it affects the desirability of legislation on the subject of vivisection, we will conclude the present essay.

The suffering inflicted in physiological experiments, we must once more remind our readers, is at least not wantonly inflicted. It is, at least, not inflicted causelessly or carelessly, or as a mere matter of convenience or amusement, but deliberately for a set purpose, and as part of a toilsome and generally ill-rewarded course of study, and by a small class of men who, as a rule, are certainly not deficient either in humanity or enlightenment. The physiologist, in this country at least, is generally also a physician or a surgeon, who spends a considerable portion both of his time and his labour in the unrequited service of the poor and suffering. Let us see whether the same can be said of the sufferings endured by the lower animals at the hands of other classes of mankind: we omit the stock instances of cruelty—the crimping of fish, the skinning of eels, and many similar customs; merely remarking that, though we believe nobody defends them, yet nobody thinks it worth his while to go out of his way to attempt to abolish them. But we are confident that any man who will use his eyes and his understanding as he goes about the world, will find that, *as a rule*, the relation subsisting between man and the lower animals is simply that of cruel oppression on the one hand, and helpless suffering on the other; or, more correctly speaking, that the welfare of the animal creation is simply not taken into account by the major part of mankind, when brought into relation with it. Of course, exceptional instances in plenty will occur to the mind of any educated man, and on the first view, as he calls to mind chiefly his own friends and their conduct towards their domestic animals, he may be disposed to repudiate the charge as too sweeping; but, we believe, a little further consideration will convince him that it is not so. Sights, to which we have been accustomed all our lives, do not awaken any special associations in our minds until we come to look at them from a special point of view. Let any man go into a market or a fair, in almost any town in England, and he will soon see that the one matter considered is the convenience of the buyers and sellers, and that the comfort and even the freedom from torment of the animals exposed for sale, does not seem to enter into consideration in the slightest degree. In one corner he may see a drove of Welsh or Irish ponies driven together in a mass, while one fellow cracks a long whip about the drove in all directions, and crams the frightened and half-starved creatures into a space so small that it is matter of wonder that any of them come out with whole limbs, and another seizes on one unfortunate brute that is to be shown to a customer, drags about its mouth, and kicks and drives it hither and thither, precisely as if it were a machine quite incapable of feeling. In another direction he may see a herd of oxen goaded into pens, in which all movement is impossible, and standing sweltering in the heat of an August sun, with bloodshot eyes and sore feet, and lips clogged with mucous, and suffering all the agonies of unslaked thirst. He may leave the fair in disgust, or more probably because he has finished his business and wants to get home to dinner, and as he drives along he will pass cart after cart containing two or three, or half a dozen, wretched calves, placed on their backs, with their feet tied tightly together with cords, and their heads hanging over the tail-board of the cart; and he may, if it so please him, reflect upon the almost unspeakable agony which is implied in the forcible retention of one position, and that an unnatural and painful one, for many hours in succession. Such examples crowd upon the memory upon the very slightest consideration of the subject, and we have even now said nothing of the fate of costermongers' donkeys, or of the methods employed by butchers for destroying life—though on the latter subject there is plenty to be said—or of a hundred other matters of the kind. But to take an apparently milder instance; let any of our readers reflect, the next time his convenience compels him to hurry to a railway station, as he hears the swish, swish, thwack, thwack, of the cabman's whip, in relation to how much bodily pain that must stand, when it hardly serves to force along the aching limbs and half-filled stomach of the unhappy horse at the rate of some six or seven miles per hour, and he will perceive how very slight account we mostly take in the commonest transactions of life of mere animal suffering. We do not say that these things are as they should be, nor do we even assert that some of them, at least, might not well be checked by legislative enactment; we merely bring them forward in this place, in order to show how continually the ordinary machinery of our lives produces animal suffering, and how much of this is brought about from mere wantonness or as a mere matter of convenience, and how, for the most part, in our present stage of civilization, we are habitually indifferent to it.

There is, however, one other custom, or class of customs, which is looked upon as peculiarly English, to which we must refer in illustration of this matter, viz., sporting and game preserving. Fox-hunting, the first of English field sports, is certainly also the least cruel, and may probably with justice be acquitted of the charge of cruelty altogether. For while no one who has had any experience of it can doubt the correctness of the old huntsman's opinion, that "the horses and the dogs like the sport as well as the gentlemen," there is some reason to hope, if the principles laid down by Mr. Rowell be correct, that the fox, if he does not "like it too," has at least no very valid reason to object to it, inasmuch as it is almost the only way in which, in the present day, he can meet his inevitable death, in what Mr. Rowell has shown to be the most natural and least painful man-

ner. The only cruelty therefore remaining is the constructive cruelty of preserving foxes for the purpose of the chase. Horse-racing occupies a somewhat more exceptionable position, since it is hard to justify the severe and cruel punishment so often inflicted on horses towards the end of a race. But whether this can be defended or not is a matter of little importance; for most undoubtedly the typical form in which the modern English sporting instinct develops itself, at least among the wealthier classes, is that of shooting; and the cruelty of shooting cannot well be questioned. The birds that are shot and bagged are killed out of hand, and it makes but little difference for our present purpose, if an animal is to be killed for the table, whether it is shot as it flies over a stubble-field or has its neck wrung in a farmyard; but not all the birds that are shot, it must be remembered, are bagged. There are birds with broken legs and broken wing-bones, which flutter down into the cover, and which the retriever fails to find. And what is the condition of these? Why, they may be picked up, as we are told by sportsmen, days and days after they have been shot, and you may find the broken limbs in every stage of inflammation, swollen and red, and tender and suppurating, and the animal dragging itself about with what limbs it has remaining, and suffering all the time the additional agony of starvation — an agony probably in its case much more severe than that arising from its wounds. It is to be observed, too, that by keeping down, as we commonly do, all beasts of prey in our woods, except, perhaps, an occasional fox, we deprive the wounded creatures, in most cases, of their rightful refuge in a natural and merciful death. The case of a winged bird is, in fact, precisely that of an animal submitted to vivisection without any provision being made either for the extinction of sensibility during the process or of life at its termination; except, indeed, that in the one case the experiment is made carefully and for a definite and useful purpose, in the other carelessly and for sport; the one is performed perhaps once, where the other occurs a thousand times.

Now, we do not intend from all this to proceed to the conclusion that it is expedient, or even desirable, that we should immediately make an attempt to put down the cruelty of shooting and gamekeeping by legislation; but we do consider that even this hasty and imperfect survey of facts is sufficient to show that, whether rightly or wrongly, it is not the habit of our present age to put the sufferings of the lower animals into serious competition with the convenience, or even with the pleasures, of mankind; and that while for these purposes suffering is inflicted habitually and as it were wholesale, and without care or check, by all classes of men, gentle and simple alike, it would be the very height of absurdity to endeavour to check by legislative enactment its infliction by a small class of enlightened and laborious men by whom it is practised but rarely, and even then not wantonly or for amusement, but with care and pains, and for no less a purpose than to extend the empire of human knowledge, and to diminish the amount of human suffering. Surely, to make any such attempt were indeed to begin our reforms at the wrong end of our social system, to strain at a gnat after swallowing innumerable camels.

ART. VI.—THE POLISH INSURRECTION OF 1863.

The Private History of a Polish Insurrection. From official and unofficial Sources. By H. SUTHERLAND EDWARDS, late Correspondent of the *Times* in Poland. London: 1865.

THE insurrection which ended so disastrously not quite two years ago has left the Polish question as far from a solution as ever. Though for the moment thoroughly subdued, the Poles show no disposition to be reconciled to their conquerors, and the next European complication will doubtless raise in them new hopes and again call the attention of the world to their patriotism and their wrongs. Their political condition is, indeed, so entirely exceptional, and so intimately connected with the distribution of power on the Continent, that it is scarcely possible to conceive of any great political convulsion taking place in Europe in which they would be not more or less directly concerned. The position of their country, divided politically between the great monarchies of the North, yet as much united in customs, language, and national feeling as in the most prosperous days of its independence, is in itself an anomaly, and cannot be regarded otherwise than as a provisional and abnormal state of things, maintained by sheer violence, and therefore certain to be disturbed by the first modification of the forces which alone uphold it. Nor is it easy to see how the conditions of the Polish problem can under present circumstances be altered. The title of "the most unfortunate of nations" which has been given to Poland ill describes the peculiarity which distinguishes her from the other nations of Europe. If the Poles had had nothing but misfortune to complain of, we should have heard the last of them long ago. It is not because she is the most unfortunate, but because she is the most wronged of the European nations, that Poland has persisted for nearly a century in rejecting the rule of the foreigner and keeping open her "question" for the terror of despots and the vexation of diplomatists. No nation in history with anything like so long and glorious an independent existence has been treated with such indignity, or seen the rights conferred upon it by charters and treaties so unscrupulously violated; and, in a patriotic and high-spirited race like the Poles, the sense of such wrongs must always keep alive the desire of independence, however hopeless it may appear.

Among the many insurrections by means of which the Poles have striven to extricate themselves from their intolerable position, the last

has certainly been the most important in its bearings on European politics and the most significant in its results. Its rise and progress, however, were involved in so much mystery, that very vague ideas regarding it prevailed at the time, not only among the general public, but also among the statesmen whose business it was to inform themselves of the real facts of the case, and whose mistakes exposed us to the alternative of war or humiliation. The mendacious telegrams and biassed pamphlets and newspaper articles published by the partisans of both sides of course only added to the confusion already existing in the public mind. According to the writers of the school of the *Opinion Nationale*, Poland was a nation of heroes, who had risen as one man, from the Dnieper to the Vistula, to expel the Russians from their country; a national army of 92,000 men, completely equipped, and recruited from all classes, had been levied to do the patriotic work, and peasants as well as nobles in all parts of the country strictly obeyed the orders of the National Government. The friends of Russia, on the other hand, never tire of telling us* that Poland is not a nation at all, that the insurgents were a set of cowards and vagabonds, that the peasants ardently desire to be incorporated with Russia, and that the insurrection was the work of a dissolute and reactionist nobility, who strove to interest Europe in the sufferings of an imaginary Poland in order to free themselves from the civilising influence of Russia, and enable them to bring back their country to the state of misery and ignorance in which it was before its partition. It is refreshing to turn from these extravagant vagaries of a blind partisanship to the lucid and singularly conscientious and impartial work of Mr. Edwards. The peculiar value of his book consists in the spirit of fairness and moderation in which it is written, and his evident anxiety to represent the origin and nature of the insurrection in their true light. His visits to the country, both before and during the struggle, enabled him to study the question on the spot, and he has done this with an amount of care and discrimination which is very seldom to be met with in the productions of a "special correspondent." The two volumes of which his work is composed form decidedly the best and most complete book which has yet appeared on the insurrection. The letters sent by him to the *Times* in 1863, most of which are reprinted in the second volume, give a faithful and animated picture, by an acute observer, of the state of feeling in Poland and Russia during the struggle; and the two together contain a mass of information which for the first time furnishes the materials for a clear and impartial judgment on the subject.

The cause of the late insurrection has been explained in many ways. Lord Russell, with characteristic simplicity, attributed it to the bad government of the Emperor Nicholas; Mr. Edwards thinks it was caused by an idea among the Poles that Russia was exhausted, and that France would help Poland as it had helped Italy. We are inclined to agree with the Pole quoted by Mr. Edwards in his second volume (p. 216), that it was a "patriotic eruption"—a movement begun, no doubt, by a few desperate and misguided men, but which would at once have died away of itself had it not been taken up and carried on by every man in the country who was capable of political feeling of any kind. The movement was essentially an impulsive one; for every sensible Pole condemned it, and saw its folly, though he felt he could not refrain from joining it. The nation had been insulted and provoked beyond endurance, and sprang blindly on its oppressor regardless of consequences, as a spirited boy would spring on a strong man under the same circumstances, though perfectly aware that he would, in all probability, be beaten in the end. Whatever may have been the justice of the reasons which prevented the Poles from rising during the Crimean war, it is evident that the case at that time was very different. It is true that the system of Nicholas was a deliberate attempt to crush out the Polish nationality, and that his government in Poland was an unmitigated despotism; but he did not set up, like Alexander, for a liberal and benevolent monarch; he did not encourage hopes which he afterwards treated with contempt, or flaunt in the face of Europe reforms which in Poland were known to have no real existence. An insurrection in Poland during the Crimean war would have been a deliberate attempt to throw off the yoke of Russia; and certainly, if we consider that instead of striking at once at the most vulnerable point of the empire, where they knew well that they would instantly be joined by the whole population, the allied Powers attacked Russia in the Crimea, it is easy to understand that the Poles should have declined to rise unless the allies formally engaged to obtain a certain minimum of concessions for them as one of the conditions of peace. There can be little doubt that, though France and England would have been glad of an insurrection in Poland, as a means of diverting the attention of Russia during their operations in the Crimea, they never seriously intended to give any support to such an insurrection, and that it was because this was the belief of the Poles, and not because there were a hundred thousand Russian soldiers in their country, that they determined not to risk embarking in an enterprise the failure of which would have been at least as disastrous to them as was that of the last insurrection.

In order clearly to understand the state of feeling in Poland when the insurrection broke out, we must go back to the period of the accession of the present Emperor. When the news of the death of Nicholas reached Warsaw, every Pole felt as if an immense weight had been removed from his breast, and the reaction produced in the nation a buoyancy of spirits and a readiness to receive impressions which were the natural results of the removal of the grinding tyranny it had suffered for the last five-and-twenty years. It was while the Poles

* See "Situation de la Pologne." Par L. Moller. Paris: 1865; and "Plus de Pologne." Par Lucien Fouque. Paris: 1865.

were in the midst of this sort of mental intoxication that the news came of proposals having been made in their favour during the Paris Conference, and of a promise from Count Orloff to the representatives of the Powers that the Emperor would grant an amnesty and certain liberal reforms to Poland. Shortly afterwards the Emperor visited Warsaw, and the Poles, whose hopes had now risen to a pitch of feverish excitement, determined to give him a splendid reception. The greatest attentions were paid him during his stay in the city, and a magnificent ball was given to him by the nobility; but all the enthusiasm in his favour was chilled in a moment by the famous speech in which he informed the Poles that he would allow "no dreams," and that he would maintain what his father did. Mr. Edwards tells a curious story apropos of this speech, which we do not remember to have seen before. It appears that during his journey from Kieff to Warsaw, the Emperor called on Count Jezierski, the delegate from the Polish Diet who during the revolution of 1830 went to St. Petersburg with prince Lubecki to propose to the Emperor Nicholas the union of the ancient provinces of Poland with the kingdom under a constitutional Government, as the only condition on which the Poles would consent to lay down their arms, and who, finding that the Emperor would accept no terms, afterwards recommended the Diet to yield, and was consequently looked upon as a traitor by the Poles and as a friend by the Russian Government. What passed between Alexander and the Count is not known, but it is said that the harsh words about the "dreams" of the Poles, which the Emperor uttered, as if by an afterthought, at the end of a complimentary speech to the nobles, seemed to be addressed especially to Jezierski. Mr. Edwards infers from this that, at the interview between the Emperor and Jezierski, the latter renewed the proposal he had made to the Emperor Nicholas in 1830; and that it was to this proposal that Alexander alluded when he spoke of the dreams of the Poles, and of his determination to maintain what his father had established—*i. e.*, the substitution of a Russian for a Polish administration in the Polish provinces incorporated with the Russian Empire. This is certainly the only intelligible explanation of the Emperor's conduct on this occasion, as, even if he had intended to maintain the cruel and tyrannical system of Nicholas (which his subsequent acts show he did not), there could have been no reason for brutally reminding the Poles of their past sufferings, treating their hopes of an amelioration of their condition as "dreams," and informing them that he would continue to persecute and oppress them as his father did. At the same time, there can be no doubt that the Poles understood his words in this sense, and that such is their obvious meaning, whatever may have been the intention with which they were said. The "dreams" of Poland were at that time of a very vague character, and had not yet assumed the form of any definite demand or wish. All the Poles felt was that they had been cruelly ill-treated and trampled on; that a new monarch, with a reputation for liberal intentions, was now their ruler; and that there was a hope of their condition being considerably bettered, both politically and morally. At the bottom of these feelings was, of course, an ardent desire for national independence; but every reasonable man in the country knew well that the time for the realisation of such a desire must be far distant, and that all that could be done in the meanwhile was to raise the material prosperity of the country and fit it for political life. This was the programme of Count Andrew Zamoyski; and for a time he had all the intelligence of the country with him. Had the Russian Government accepted the situtation—had it strictly adhered to its own laws* and the reforms it introduced, allowing the Poles to take full advantage of the concessions made to them, but not to advance a step beyond the limit of what was granted them by the laws of the country—the insurrection, we are persuaded, would not have taken place, as the Government would have had the support of the only men who could have made it formidable; and Russian Poland would now have presented a picture of quiet prosperity such as it has never shown since it came under foreign rule. Of course, directly an opportunity presented itself, the Poles would none the less have striven to regain their independence; but this result was inevitable and was certainly not to be retarded or prevented by misgovernment and insult. The only alternative for Russia, while the Poles are under her rule (and they will do their best to escape from it in any case,) is either to keep them turbulent and discontented, at a vast expense of blood and money to herself, or to make them peaceful and obedient subjects by the same means as are adopted by every civilized Government that wishes to secure the goodwill of the people. Unfortunately, this was not the course taken by the Government of the Emperor Alexander. His first step was to grant an amnesty to the Polish exiles on his accession, which was saddled with the humiliating condition of expressing repentance for the "guilty error" of fighting for one's country, and did not return to the exiles their confiscated estates, though it was doubtless a substantial benefit to the thousands of Poles who were wearing away their hopeless lives in Siberia. An act equally ungracious, and far more galling to the national feeling, was the refusal of the Emperor, on his second visit to Warsaw with the Empress in 1857, to receive any Polish lady not dressed in the Russian costume, or any Polish gentleman not in the Government service. The establishment of the Agricultural Society in 1858, and the replacement, in 1859, of the old system of conscription by designation by the French system of conscription by ballot, were two real and valuable reforms; but their subsequent withdrawal by the Russian Government was felt by Poland the more deep-

* The Poles resemble the English and the Americans in their almost pedantic adherence to law. "The country," to use the language of the official report on the condition of the kingdom of Poland presented to the Emperor in March, 1861, "is radically imbued with the sense of law."

ly that they were so real and valuable. As for the material condition of the Poles, under the mild rule of Prince Gortchakoff, it was, no doubt, considerably improved. Until the national demonstrations began there was no political persecution or yearly conscription, as in the days of Nicholas, and the price of foreign passports was reduced so low as to enable a large number of Poles to visit foreign countries.

The era of "demonstrations" began in October, 1860, when the three northern sovereigns met—for the purpose, as was generally supposed, of renewing the Holy Alliance and plotting against France and the newly-liberated kingdom of Italy—in the capital of the country which their predecessors had dismembered This proceeding naturally provoked the Poles to the utmost; the principal Polish families left Warsaw, and the stay of the Emperor and his allies in that city was made so uncomfortable by numerous petty vexations got up by the inhabitants, that the fêtes given on the occasion were suddenly broken off, and the monarchs returned prematurely to their respective capitals. This was another of the many instances of gratuitous insult offered to the Poles by their rulers, who seem to think that the best mode of extinguishing the feeling of nationality in Poland is to outrage it in every possible way. It is a favourite and plausible argument of writers on the Russian side, that it is useless to grant any concessions to the Poles, as they only employ them for the purpose of achieving their independence, and that Russia cannot be expected to give up her share of Poland now, because she was perhaps not quite blameless in seizing it a hundred years ago; but it is impossible to test this argument by practical experience, for Russia has never given the Poles an opportunity of becoming reconciled to her rule, but, on the contrary, has provoked them by constant insult to resist and detest her. It is not by insulting, but by paying the greatest respect to their feeling of nationality, that the Scotch have been turned into Englishmen, the Lithuanians into Poles, and the Norwegians into Swedes; and it is but natural that the Poles, with their unparalleled grievances and fiery patriotism, should bitterly resent such outrages to their nation from a race less civilized, and with a far shorter and less glorious history than their own. The meeting of the three sovereigns in the Polish capital was so deeply felt, that it was determined to organize a series of patriotic demonstrations as a sort of protest against the conduct of the Government. On the 29th of November, the anniversary of the outbreak which preceded the insurrection of 1830, an immense procession paraded the streets of Warsaw, singing the national hymn; and this demonstration was followed in the next few months by a great number of similar ones, until that of the 25th February, 1861, (the anniversary of the battle of Grochow,*) was dispersed by force. This procession was, like the others, composed of unarmed men, and it was stopped by the troops, who, finding that they could not approach the torch-bearers in the procession, who directed the flames of their torches towards the nostrils of the chargers, drew their swords and sabred many persons in the crowd. The affair of the 27th February was still more serious. A funeral procession, passing along the chief street of the town on its way to the cemetery, was attacked by the Cossacks, apparently under the impression that it was another demonstration. As it did not break up, the Cossacks were called back and replaced by a detachment of infantry, who fired on the unarmed crowd without warning, and killed five men, whose bodies were taken charge of by the Poles, and carried in procession to the cemetery three days afterwards. The Government on this occasion appears to have lost all presence of mind, and it was so apprehensive of the consequences of its acts that for the moment it abdicated its functions, and left the city entirely in the hands of the Poles. The result showed that this confidence was not misplaced, for although the procession which followed the bodies of the victims was more than three miles long, the whole of the Polish population of Warsaw having joined in it, the proceedings passed off in the greatest tranquillity.

It was during the above demonstrations, and especially after the massacres of February, that a revolutionary party began to organize itself in Warsaw. It so happened that these massacres followed immediately upon the resolutions passed by the Agricultural Society (20th February), with the object of making the peasants freeholders, and the moment was therefore thought ripe by Mieroslawski and the few adherents he then had in Warsaw to prepare for an insurrection, as the peasantry would be more likely to take an interest in political matters, and to unite with the nobles in an armed movement, when they became landowners and citizens themselves. The plan of Mieroslawski was to carry out a gigantic propaganda in Russia and Poland, of which the instruments in Russia would be the Polish officers and civil functionaries, and in Poland the proprietors, the former spreading seditious and revolutionary opinions among the Russians, in order to produce a revolution, and the latter cultivating the good-will of the peasants, and filling them with patriotic sentiments, so as to make them ready to rise when the proper moment arrived. The sympathies of Europe were in the meantime to be enlisted by continual attacks on Russia in the press and by accounts of Russian atrocities, real or invented. This plan, like its author, found few supporters in Poland, either at the time it was conceived or subsequently. Some of Mieroslawski's adherents, indeed, went even farther than Mieroslawski himself, for they were too impatient to wait for the execution of his scheme, and conceived the mad project of beginning the insurrection on the day of the funeral of the five men shot in the massacre of the 27th of February. The fact that there was not the smallest disturbance on that day showed how little the ideas of these enthusiasts were shared by the people. The truth is, that at

* Grochow is a town near Warsaw, where the Polish insurgents of 1830 fought their first great battle, and gained their first great victory against the Russians.

that time not only would the Poles as a body have nothing to do with Mieroslawski's plan—one part of which, as Mr. Edwards well observes, "could only have been carried out by a nation of scoundrels, another only by a nation of brave and generous men"—but that they were not disposed to encourage or carry out any plan at all with the object of preparing an insurrection. If the Government had quietly but firmly taken its stand on its legal rights, making no opposition to harmless demonstrations, but severely punishing any infraction of the law, it would not have been even then too late to obtain the respect, if not the support, of the Poles. But the Government only irritated and strengthened the discontent which was already deepening into open hostility. The events of the 25th and 27th produced so profound an impression in Poland, that the whole nation went spontaneously into mourning, and adopted all the outward tokens of deep and sincere grief. "The unanimity," says Mr. Edwards, "of all Poles capable of national feeling of any kind in presence of the acts of ferocity committed by the Russians was shown, not only in the adoption of mourning, but also in the wearing of Polish mementoes, the abandonment of dancing and of public amusements of all kinds, and in the crowded attendance at the churches wherever a service was to be performed in honour of some Polish patriot, or in commemoration of some great day in the history of Poland. If all this was contrived by the men who aimed only at bringing about an appeal to arms, it was certainly contrived most cunningly." This silent protest of the nation was worthily seconded by the conduct of those who acted as its representatives. Not only did the marshals of the nobility wait upon Prince Gortchakoff to protest against the violence of the troops, but eight members of the Polish Agricultural Society, together with the principal members of the municipality, the heads of the clergy of all denominations, and other notabilities of the capital, sent an address to the Emperor, exposing the grievances of the nation, but making no specific demand. "A country once on a level with the civilization of its Christian neighbours cannot," so said the address, "grow morally or materially, so long as its church, its legislation, its public instruction, and its whole social organization are forcibly subjected to foreign innovation, and withdrawn from the national influence. . . . . All confidence has ceased between the governing and the governed; repression, however violent, however obstinate, can never recall it." This address was signed by the Archbishop of Warsaw, the President of the Evangelical Consistory, the Chief Rabbi, and all the principal persons of Warsaw, besides a vast number of private persons of all classes, and from all parts of the country; yet the Emperor, in his answer to this document, contemptuously described it as the petition "of a few individuals," and added that he ought to treat it as if it had never existed, but that, nevertheless, he would grant certain reforms, the principal of which were the formation of a Polish Council of State and of elective district and municipal councils. The indignation produced among the Poles by this reply was still further increased by the dissolution of the Agricultural Society—the body to which the people were accustomed to look as a sort of national representation, and which, from the moderation of its views and the high position of many of its members, would have been the least likely to act in factious opposition to the Government. The day after the dissolution, an immense crowd of persons proceeded to the house of Count Andrew Zamoyski, the president of the society, to protest against it, and the day after another crowd assembled in front of Prince Gortchakoff's palace. On the first occasion the troops did not interfere; but on the second they made a deliberate attack on the people, which Mr. Edwards thus graphically describes:—

"The procession, after leaving the cemetery, made its way to the Sigismund-square, and there stationed itself in front of the palace occupied by the Imperial Lieutenant. The national hymn was sung; newspapers containing the Emperor's reply to the Warsaw address were burned; the crowd, summoned by several officers, and called upon and entreated by Prince Gortchakoff himself to withdraw, refused to move; and, ultimately, when full warning had been given—but also when no act of violence had been committed—the Russians fired upon the unarmed people, and from time to time renewed the slaughter until at last the square was evacuated. On this, as on so many other occasions of the same kind, the utmost fortitude was displayed by the Poles. Very few left the square in obedience to the summons of the Russian officers. The vast majority knelt down, and sang the patriotic hymn. The leaders of the manifestations exhorted the timid to be firm, and here and there joined hands to prevent their departure. Some were actually attracted to the spot by the first discharge. Among others, a Jewish student named Landé joined the crowd after the firing had begun, and was raising a wounded man from the ground when he was himself struck to the heart. Thus the people of Warsaw protested with terrible earnestness against the dominion of Russia in Poland."

It was about this time that a distinct difference of opinion began to manifest itself between the various parties in Poland. From the 2nd of March to the 7th of April (the day before the massacre above described) the city had been perfectly quiet, having been entirely given up to the Poles, and order having been preserved by the exertions of Polish special constables. The Emperor's reply to the address, however, and the dissolution of the Agricultural Society, added considerably to the numbers of those who thought that it was useless to negotiate with Russia any longer, and the result was that a regular system of passive resistance was entered upon. The great majority of this party (which Mr. Edwards calls the "party of action"), though they aimed at ultimately bringing about a rising, were opposed to any precipitate measures, and wished to postpone the movement until a sufficient quantity of arms should be obtained, and the aid of the peasants secured by making them freeholders. The latter step had been already proposed by the Agricultural Society, which, however, had added to its pro-

posal the recommendation that the landlord should be partly compensated for the loss of his land by a series of yearly payments, made by the peasant for a certain number of years. The party of action, on the other hand, wished to relieve the peasant from making any payment at all to the landlord, whom it proposed to compensate out of the State treasury, after the country had recovered its independence. The other great party in Poland was the White or moderate party, chiefly consisting of the landowners, as the Reds or democrats chiefly belonged to the class of workmen and small traders. It desired the independence of Poland as ardently as the Reds, but it was opposed to forcible measures, being of opinion that an insurrection at that time would have no chance of success, and that the best course for the Poles to pursue was to improve the material condition of their country as much as possible, and take advantage of any concessions the Government might be disposed to make; at the same time continuing to press the demand for a national administration for the whole of Russian Poland. These opinons were, in fact, those of the great majority of the country, until the Government strengthened the "Reds" by its policy of incessant provocation. Count Andrew Zamoyski, popularly known as "Mr. Andrew," was the chief of the moderate party, whose opinions he fully shared, and the influence which he possessed over the people of all classes was strikingly shown by the marvellous order and tranquillity with which tens of thousands of Poles followed the funeral procession of the victims of the massacre of the 27th of February, after he had given his word to the Government that the funeral should take place without disturbance. So great, indeed, was his influence, that many believe that if he had been allowed to remain in Poland he would have prevented the insurrection, for both the Whites and Reds were agreed that the outbreak was premature, and the small party of revolutionists who originated it were at first its only supporters.

The "reforms" introduced by the Russian Government in March, 1861, consisted of the following measures:—First, the department of ecclesiastical affairs was separated from that of the interior, and a commission of public worship and instruction was established—an administrative reform which was a mere matter of official convenience. Second, a Council of State, composed of Poles nominated by the Emperor, was instituted, whose function it was to deliberate privately on measures submitted to it by the Government, but which had no power either of initiative or decision. Third, elective district and municipal councils were established, whose functions were also restricted to deliberation on matters laid before them by the Government commissioners. These concessions, which, it must be confessed, went but a very little way towards fulfilling the desire of the country for a national representation, were nevertheless accepted by the Poles; the only party that urged their rejection was the insignificant one of the revolutionists. The municipal elections took place in September, 1861, in perfect order, and most of the members chosen belonged to the moderate party; yet the Government, with its usual perverseness, proclaimed Poland in a state of siege a fortnight afterwards, for the reason, among others, that persons hostile to the Russian authorities had been returned in the elections. Then came the siege of the churches by the soldiery on the anniversary of the death of Kosciuszko, when the congregations were shut up for eighteen hours without food, and afterwards marched off to the citadel. The popular indignation had now reached its highest pitch, and the two great parties organised themselves into political societies, with a common fund, a secret journal which was the organ of each, and directing committees. Mr. Edwards gives the following interesting account of the organisation of the two parties:—

"The organisation of the White party was based on that of the late Agricultural Society. It had groups of members among the landed proprietors of every district in the kingdom, and its affairs were directed by a committee of three, sitting at Warsaw. This party had already considerable funds at its disposal, including the subscriptions received from the members of the Agricultural Society, the proceeds of various collections made after religious celebrations in the churches at Warsaw and in the provinces, as well as contributions from other sources. . . . At their meeting of October 17, 1861, the extreme men of the party of action resolved to organise a National Committee, which was the origin of the 'Central National Committee,' which, after the appeal to arms, united with the directing committee of the moderate or White party, out of which combination the first 'National Government' was formed. A plan was drawn up in writing, in which it was specified that the committee should be divided into three sections—one for the propagation of patriotic ideas, and for making known the general decisions of the committee; a second for financial matters, and for the preparation of circulars and addresses; a third for enrolling and arming intending combatants. Each of these sections was directed by a chief, to whom an assistant was attached, capable, if necessary, of replacing him. . . . When the formation of the National Committee was first decided upon, the party of action, which the committee was to represent, had only a sum of from five to six hundred pounds at its disposal. Of this, a little more than half had been collected after a religious service ordered by some government officials in memory of those who fell in the massacres, and the remainder after two similar services ordered respectively by the association of hackney coachmen and the association of house porters. The Polish insurrection of 1863 has been called an aristocratic movement; but the porters and cab-drivers of Warsaw were getting up subscriptions in furtherance of the insurrection at a time when the prudent landed proprietors were doing all in their power to stop it."

The establishment of this secret committee naturally gave rise to a great many abuses, some of which, such as the assassinations, were universally deplored in the country. This was especially the case with regard to the attempt on the Grand Duke Constantine, who was wounded by a misguided fanatic on the day after his arrival at Warsaw as the Emperor's lieutenant (July 3, 1863). There can be no doubt that this appointment was made with the intention of conciliating

the people; but the excitement was already too great in the country for it to be pacified merely by the Emperor's brother coming to rule over it as viceroy. No reforms were introduced, or even promised, during the first two months of his government, the state of siege was maintained in all its rigour, a number of vexatious decrees about costume were issued, and the leaders of the national demonstrations were stigmatised in official proclamation, as "a band of malefactors." At length, on the 27th of August, the Grand Duke issued a manifesto, in which he assured the Poles that he did not consider them responsible for the acts of an individual malefactor, and called upon them to support his Government. In consequence of this appeal, between 300 and 400 of the principal landed proprietors met at the Hôtel de l'Europe, and drew up an address, in which they stated that they did not refuse their support to the new institutions given to the Kingdom, but strongly recommended their extension to the rest of Russian Poland—*i.e.*, the Polish provinces seized by Russia at the first, second, and third partitions. They further represented that the only mode of securing the loyal and cordial co-operation of the Poles with the Russian Government would be to unite the whole of Russian Poland under a Polish administration and with a constitution. It will be remarked here that the Poles had not yet finally broken with the Russian Government, since they offered to accept terms which were very far from the fulfilment of their desire for national independence, but, on the contrary, were rather calculated to prevent it, by opening the door to a reconciliation with Russia. The danger to Russia of giving the Kingdom of Poland, even with its provinces, a constitution, would certainly not have been greater than that which already existed from the revolutionary organization which spread its ramifications over the provinces as well as the Kingdom, and which would have been paralyzed by the establishment of a national Polish government with the Emperor of Russia at its head as King of Poland. Even supposing that the organization would have been maintained after the cessation of all just cause of discontent, the Russian troops and police would have had quite as much power over it under the new state of things as under the old, for a Polish government could as little have suffered the existence of an illegal society as a Russian one. That the small party of Liberals in Russia would have asked for a constitution if one were given to Poland is probable; but they had already done this when there was no thought of giving Poland a constitution, and the Emperor would have had no difficulty in acting as he thought fit about the matter in the present case, as he did on the former occasion. The truth is, that a constitutional movement in Russia is easily put down, for it is sure to be confined only to a very small section of the population, the great bulk of the people neither understanding nor caring about what we call freedom. "The Pole," says Mr. Edwards, "with all his wrongs and all his sufferings, is still a freer man than the Russian. His soul is free, and in certain supreme cases he will, without reference to the innumerable *ukazes* and *prikazes* directed against him, do what, in accordance with the liberal traditions of a thousand years, he feels to be just and proper. The Russian, on the other hand, feeling that in his country there is not and never has been any such thing as legality, dares not, and, morally speaking, cannot, take his stand even upon such rights as are plainly given to him by the written law." The Emperor could, therefore, without any great danger to his empire, and with a good chance of pacifying the Poles, have granted the concessions they asked for. The main difficulty of the matter no doubt was, that the Russians have been lately taught by official falsifications of history to look upon the Polish provinces as originally Russian, and that the administrative union of those provinces with the kingdom would have seemed to them an abandonment of Russian territory.* It is pretty certain, however, that if the Government, which was the original promoter of this error, had allowed the union, the Russian people would not at that time have made any serious objection to it, whatever may have been the case when the interference of the Western Powers made the question appear one of national honour. At any rate, the Poles of Lithuania and Ruthenia are not to be blamed for remaining Poles, in spite of the assertion of the Russian Government that they are Russians; and the framers of the Warsaw address were quite right to say that the Russian Government could not be supported by the Polish people unless the institutions given to the Kingdom were also given to the provinces, for they knew well that liberal institutions restricted to the Kingdom alone would be no satisfaction to the rest of Russian Poland. The national agitation was as great in the ancient provinces of Poland as in the Kingdom, and the desire for administrative union was as strong, as was proved by the petitions of the landowners of Podolia and Minsk. The Government, however, not only rejected the demand of the Poles, but did so in a manner which could only add to the detestation that it already inspired in all parts of the country. Although the Warsaw address had not been presented, nor even signed, the fact of its having been placed in the hands of Count Andrew Zamoyski was deemed sufficient to justify the removal of that eminent patriot from the country; and the landowners of Podolia, who in presenting their address only exercised a right which is granted to them by the Russian law, were banished in a body into Russia. The Government had now, in fact, cleared the way for the insurrection, for it had alienated the class which by its position would naturally be most disposed to support it, and had turned out of Poland the only man who was sufficiently moderate in his views to be willing to accept any

* "The civilization of both Lithuania and Ruthenia is entirely Polish—as that of Brittany is French, that of Wales English.... The astonishing discovery was made, during the reign of the Emperor Nicholas, that the provinces seized by Russia at the three partitions of the eighteenth century were not Polish at all, but Russian. Neither the Emperor Alexander I., nor the Emperor Paul, nor the Empress Catharine II., had the least suspicion of this."—*Edwards.*

real overtures for a reconciliation, and at the same time sufficiently popular in the country to ensure their acceptance by the people.

While doing full justice to the barbarous cruelty of the Russians, and the wonderful fortitude and heroism displayed by the Poles during the two eventful years which preceded the insurrection, Mr. Edwards does not, we think, give enough prominence to the radical badness of the system of government under which Poland was ruled during that period. The impression left on the mind by his book is, that the state of feeling which made the Poles so easily stirred up into insurrection was caused, not by misgovernment, but by the comparative liberty which they had enjoyed since the accession of Alexander to revive their patriotism by national demonstrations, and by the hopes of a foreign intervention in their favour; that the Russian Government was doing its best to reconcile them by reforms, which they declined to accept, as nothing would satisfy them but complete independence; and that they did wrong in not accepting the policy of Wielopolski. We must express our entire dissent from this view. We have already shown that the conduct of the Russian authorities towards the Poles was insulting and irritating in the last degree, and was in itself sufficient to provoke insurrection, even if it had not been a foreign government that thus treated them. The patriotism of the Poles, their desire to throw off the yoke of the foreigner, and their hope of a foreign intervention, no doubt contributed to produce the insurrection; but it is a mistake to ascribe it to those causes only. As for the reforms offered by the Russian Government, some of which were no doubt valuable, though they were mostly only reforms in name, apparently introduced in order to give the Emperor a reputation for Liberalism in Europe, they were all accepted and used by the Poles until the Government itself thought proper to withdraw them; and so little were the Poles disposed to reject every solution but that of national independence, that they constantly petitioned the Emperor for the concessions which were to be the condition of their becoming loyal and obedient subjects. Much has been said of the valuable reforms introduced by Marquis Wielopolski, but it is difficult to see in what they consisted. He made the administration wholly Polish; but Mr. Edwards tells us it was nearly Polish already. The Council of State and provincial councils were, as we have seen, mere forms of liberal institutions, and were not allowed to exercise any really valuable right. The only great reform connected with the name of the Marquis was that introduced in the education of the country—certainly a measure of the highest importance and value in itself, but a poor substitute for the want of every form of political life to a nation which had enjoyed representative institutions for eight centuries. It is true that Wielopolski's projects extended considerably farther than this; but the Poles refused to support them because they knew his object was to make Poland renounce her glorious past, and all she had fought and suffered for during the last century, in order to unite herself indissolubly with Russia. The Poles were ready to accept any concession that Russia might be disposed to make to them, and even to support the Russian Government if it ceased to provoke and insult them; but they were not ready to barter their national honour and their patriotic aspirations for an alliance with their enemy with the object of revenging themselves on the Western Powers for having abandoned them. For this was generally believed to be the real aim of the Marquis, whose proud spirit had been stung to the quick by the indifference with which he had been received in London when he was sent there on a mission by the Polish National Government of 1831, and who in his well-known "Letter from a Polish Nobleman to Prince Metternich" had recommended the Poles to adopt a policy of this kind. The reforms proposed by the Marquis thus appeared to be only a sop thrown to his countrymen in order to reconcile them to a permanent union with Russia; and the Poles naturally declined to commit themselves to his policy by supporting him in proposing these reforms, although they accepted them when they were offered by the Russian Government. What was really Wielopolski's policy it was almost impossible for the Poles to ascertain, as he was extremely uncommunicative, and scarcely treated his Polish visitors with ordinary politeness; but his conduct certainly bore out the impression which generally prevailed on the subject. He sedulously avoided from the beginning associating himself with any of the phases of the national movement, even declining to be a member of the Agricultural Society; and he was quite ready to throw over the claims of the Polish provinces attached to Russia so long as the Kingdom was given an autonomy. His feeling with regard to his country was, in fact, not so much patriotism as wounded pride. It galled him to think that he belonged to a nation which was the object of universal pity, and he determined at all hazards to place it in such a position as to inspire very very different feelings. His object was above all things to throw in the lot of Poland with that of Russia, and for this he worked with all the energy of his powerful mind. Finding that the Russians would not hear of national institutions for the Polish provinces, he confined his demands to the Kingdom; and when his plans were baulked by the Red party, he attempted to get rid of it by the conscription.

When the Grand Duke Constantine was appointed Viceroy, with Marquis Wielopolski as chief of the civil government, the National Committee had for some months been in full activity. In May, 1862, the Committee already felt itself so strong that it issued papers, stamped with the arms* of the ancient Polish republic, in all parts of Poland, calling on the Poles to recognise its authority and pay a general tax for the purposes of the movement; and,

* These are, the white eagle of Poland and the mounted knight of Lithuania, to which was afterwards added the archangel of Ruthenia. The only mistake worth noticing that we have found in Mr. Edwards's book is the peculiarly English one of calling the patron saint of Ruthenia St. George instead of St. Michael.

about the same time, provincial committees were formed in communication with and under the direction of the National Committee, which was afterwards (October, 1862) altered into a "Central National Committee." When this became known to the Government, Wielopolski proposed to paralyse the national organization by removing all that were known or suspected to belong to it from the country, under the pretence of a conscription. This barbarous and utterly unjustifiable measure has been duly appreciated by the world, and will cover with lasting infamy the name of its author. It was not an attempt to "kidnap the opposition," as Lord Napier called it—for the opposition constituted the whole of the country—but to frighten the nation into adopting Wielopolski's policy. The Marquis openly declared that he wanted to bring the national eruption in the country "to a head;" he wished to produce an abortive insurrection, which would enable him to remove and discredit the revolutionists, and at the same time strike terror into the hearts of the moderate party. The way in which the conscription was carried out—the soldiers breaking into the houses at midnight, and tearing from them the men marked out by the vengeance of the Government, or, in their absence, their fathers, sons, or friends, and the official paper declaring four days after that the conscription had been received with joy and good will by the country—plainly points to the fact that it was intended to provoke an outbreak, though, of course, Wielopolski never suspected that the latter would assume the proportions it did. Unfortunately, the dissolution of the Agricultural Society and the exile of Count Zamoyski had completely disorganized the moderate party, and considerably strengthened the extreme Reds, who alone desired an insurrection. On the first of January, eleven members of this party held a meeting, at which it was resolved to begin the insurrection on the 15th (the day of the conscription). The central committee, on the other hand, which now included several members of the moderate party, considered that the time for a rising had not yet arrived, and rejected the proposal made by the committee of eleven. The day after the conscription, however, the central committee resolved to commence the insurrection on the 22d, and on that day it broke out simultaneously in all parts of the country.

We shall not here recapitulate the moving incidents of the insurrection, of which an animated and picturesque description is given in Mr. Edwards's second volume. Before concluding, however, we would say a few words on the much-debated question of the foreign intervention. Although it is certain that, even if the Poles had had no hope of foreign aid, the insurrection would have broken out all the same, we quite agree with Mr. Edwards that the chief cause of its having been prolonged and supported by all classes of Poles was the encouragement which they received from abroad. For nearly two months after the insurrection began, the moderate party held aloof from the movement, and endeavoured to persuade its authors to give it up. "The diplomacy of France and England," says Mr. Edwards, "first gave it a serious character. . . . . The insurrection grew by the enthusiasm of the townspeople and of the young men of all classes; but the general sanction and co-operation of the landowners, without which it could not possibly have lasted, were not secured until the intervention of Poland's traditional friends (and also traditional betrayers) took away from the struggle that character of utter hopelessness which it had at first presented." The leadership of the movement was at first in the hands of the extreme Reds, who attempted to make their friend Mieroslawski dictator, but only succeeded in obtaining the appointment for him conditionally on his making a position for himself in Poland before the 10th of March. By that time, however, the extreme party had lost much of its power over the affairs of the insurrection. On the 4th of March, a meeting took place at Cracow between deputies of the Red and White parties, at which a union between those parties was effected, and Mieroslawski having as yet done nothing except fighting one battle, in which he was defeated, and after which he immediately left Russian Poland, it was determined to elect Langiewicz as dictator from the 10th of March, the day on which Mieroslawski's probation was to expire. We cannot better explain the accession of the White or moderate party to the revolutionary committee than in the clear and forcible language of Mr. Edwards:—

"The *Constitutionnel* published its article declaring that, through the signing of the Prussian Convention, the Polish question had become a European question, on the 17th February; and three days afterwards, February 20th, Prince Ladislas Czartoryski telegraphed from Paris to Warsaw that the insurrection must be kept up The words '*qu'il fallait durer*' passed from mouth to mouth, and it was understood that, if the insurrection lasted long enough, France would support it by force of arms. . . . 'Keep up the fighting, and I will do my best for you,' was what the advice given to the Polish leaders in Paris really amounted to; and, considering all the circumstances; considering that the insurrection was growing naturally of itself; that the Russians were behaving most feebly, though at the same time very cruelly in their attempts to suppress it; that the Austrians were scarcely guarding the frontier at all, and were allowing detachments to be formed in the Galician woods, and arms and ammunition to be conveyed from Galicia into the Kingdom of Poland; that sympathy for the Poles was being loudly expressed in England as well as in France, and that both the English and French Governments were about to engage in diplomatic representations on behalf of Poland: considering all this, the moderate party could scarcely hold back any longer without causing their moderation to be mistaken for want of courage and want of patriotism. The White, or moderate party, were, at the last moment, obliged by circumstances, and induced by the hopes held out to them, to join the insurrection."

The Russian Government, too, far from attempting to gain the support of the moderate party, continued to provoke it into open hostility. On the 3rd of March, the anniversary of the Emperor's accession, which it was thought would be made the occasion of offering a general amnesty,

the Polish members of the Council of State, who belonged to the most moderate section of the Whites, attended the Grand Duke's levee, but not the slightest notice was taken of them; and on the 6th an order was published in the official journal of Warsaw, calling upon the peasantry to assist in re-establishing tranquillity, and empowering them to arrest all "suspicious" persons living in or passing through their villages, which "looked too much like an invitation to commence a Jacquerie for the most moderate of the moderate party to give their countenance any longer to the acts of the Government." The result was that the independent members of the Council of State resigned their seats. The moderate party having thus definitively broken with the Russian Government, a new civil government for Poland was established by the combined White and Red Committee at Cracow. This Government was to act under the name and responsibility of the Dictator, whose duties were confined to the command in the field, and two secretaries of the Government were to be attached to his person and to countersign all decrees submitted to and approved by him. The Government was composed of four departments: war, interior, finance, and foreign affairs, the latter of which only was placed in the hands of the moderate party. The dictatorship, as is known, lasted only nine days, Langiewicz having been made prisoner by the Austrians on the 19th of March; but three days before, the *Moniteur* had published the first French despatches, treating the Polish question as a European one, and the Poles were not likely to put an end to the insurrection just at the moment when France seemed to be taking up their cause; besides which, the defeat had not been sufficiently complete to justify them in giving up the struggle after having once committed themselves to it. Lord Russell, too, had endeavoured, in his despatch to Russia of March 2nd, to obtain a national Diet for Poland, and they naturally believed that, after once making such a proposition, he would not withdraw from it, so long as they continued their armed protest, without taking some serious step against Russia. Accordingly, they rejected the amnesty offered by the Emperor (which merely promised pardon to those who would lay down their arms), and continued the struggle under their national Government. There can be no question, therefore, that the continuance of the insurrection, with all its disastrous results, is chargeable to the foreign intervention. Should the intervention, then, have taken place at all? We think that, considering the grave disturbances which the insurrection was likely to produce in Europe, the pressure of public opinion in England and France, and the right given to the Powers by the Treaty of Vienna to insist on the fulfilment of the conditions under which they sanctioned the partition of Poland, it was both their duty and their interest to interfere, if there was a chance of their interference being successful. But in this matter England and France acted much as the revolutionists who began the outbreak did; they rushed blindly into action without calculating the consequences. "The chapter of accidents" was at least as much trusted to by the Western Powers as the insurgents, and was found equally deceptive by both. England hoped that Russia would yield to "moral pressure;" France hoped to drag England into a war of which Poland would be the pretext, if not the cause; Austria hoped to secure the "guarantees" she is always seeking, and never obtaining, as the price of her accession to the alliance of the West. But amid all these hopes no settled plan of action was decided upon. England opened the diplomatic campaign by boldly reproaching Russia with her violation of the treaty of Vienna, and was followed more hesitatingly by France and Austria; then, without arranging as to their future course in case of a refusal, the three Powers proposed to Russia the famous "six points," and when the refusal came, quarrelled about what they should do, and ended in doing nothing. Mr. Edwards characterises these six points in an epigrammatic sentence which will be often quoted, but which, like many such sentences, does not express the whole truth:—"Lord Russell thought he could tell the Russian Government how to pacify the Poles without destroying the Russian Empire. Give them a few things that they already had, and a few more that they didn't want, and not one particle of what they asked for, and Lord Russell was quite sure that they would be contented." A national Diet, which constituted one of the "points," was certainly not what they had, or what they didn't want, and it was a very large particle of what they asked for; and had the Powers pressed this, and their other demands (which related to institutions that had already existed, it is true, but that had been withdrawn during the insurrection), with the distinct understanding that they would ask for nothing more, and that unless their demands were granted they would retort upon Russia with some serious act of hostility, such as the withdrawal of their ambassadors, it is probable that Russia would have yielded at once, and that the insurgents, finding there was no more hope of foreign aid, would have ceased their resistance. As it was, the uncertainty of the designs, and the vagueness of the threats of the allies, only encouraged the hopes of the insurgents, and roused the Russian nation to such a degree of irritation, that the Government felt itself perfectly safe in insulting the Western Powers, and oppressing the Poles more than ever. Finally, by receiving Prince Gortchakoff's rebuff in silence, instead of either breaking off diplomatic relations or carrying out Lord Russell's abortive project of declaring that Russia had forfeited her rights to Poland because she had violated the conditions on which they were acquired, the Powers deprived themselves of the opportunity of making terms with Russia for the Poles after the insurrection, and have left them infinitely worse off than when they took them under their protection.

On this point, of the conditions by which Poland holds Russia under the Treaty of Vienna, we are surprised to see that Mr. Edwards holds Prince Gortchakoff's view, namely, that these conditions were not stipulated for by the

Western Powers, but by Russia herself. He says that she "desired most ardently at the Congress of Vienna, not only that the Kingdom of Poland should enjoy a constitution, national institutions, and all possible advantages short of complete independence, but also that this novel position for a conquered people should be guaranteed by the whole of Europe." Now, it is quite true that the Emperor Alexander desired to give a constitution to the kingdom of Poland; but it was not to the constitution, but to the "forced annexation of nearly the entire of so important and populous a territory as the Duchy of Warsaw" that Lord Castlereagh so strongly objected. Alexander's proposal was to make *this territory* into a Kingdom of Poland, with national institutions; and it is to this that Lord Castlereagh alluded when he said the Western Powers wished to avoid "that species of measure which, under the title of higher import, may create alarm both in Russia and the neighbouring States." When, however, the Emperor of Russia agreed to give up Posen to Prussia, and Galicia to Austria, the danger of a Kingdom of Poland which would be formidable to the neighbouring States was removed, and the Western Powers not only no longer objected to the formation of a Kingdom of Poland out of the small part of the Duchy of Warsaw which was left, but *insisted* on the Poles being granted national institutions as a compensation for the security Europe had lost by the partition. Thus, Prince Metternich, in his despatch to Prince Hardenberg of the 10th December, 1814,* said :—

"The Emperor not having found in your Highness's verbal note anything relative to *the constitutional question of Poland, nor to that of the reunion of the ancient Ruthenian provinces to the new acquisitions of Russia*, his Imperial Majesty directs me to call the attention of the Prussion Cabinet to *an object so essential. The demands which we have a right to make in this respect to Russia result from the engagements which the Emperor Alexander had spontaneously, of his own accord, taken towards us, in order to compensate us in a degree for his pretensions to territorial acquisitions.*"

Lord Castlereagh and Prince Talleyrand also declared that they regarded the grant of national institutions to the Poles as the only guarantee, next to the complete restoration of an independent Poland, for the security of Europe; and the three partitioning Powers were accordingly required† to give assurances regarding their intentions in this respect. The fact of Alexander having at that time been well disposed towards the Poles was certainly no security for either himself or his successors continuing to have the same sentiments under other circumstances, as the event fully proved. The truth is, that in this matter the plenipotentiaries of the Western Powers had two objects in view: they wished to prevent Russia from annexing the whole of Poland; and they wished, for their own protection, to maintain the Polish nationality in such a manner as both to pacify Poland and make her act, as a nation, independently of any other Power. Their objection to the formation of a large Kingdom of Poland was made with the first of these objects; the conditions relative to Poland in the Treaty were imposed upon Russia and the two other partitioning Powers.

Mr. Edwards is of opinion that the only definite solution of the Polish question must be the restoration of the whole of Poland to independence, and that the Poles will not be satisfied with less. In this we quite agree with him; but the time for such a solution is probably very far distant, and are the inhabitants of Russian Poland to endure a renewal of the horrors of the government of Nicholas in the meanwhile? The last unhappy insurrection seems to have created a belief in Russia that it is impossible to hold Poland except by the sword, and that the Poles only make use of concessions and reforms to turn them against their rulers. We think the events which preceded the insurrection teach a very different lesson. They show that the Poles were ready to accept concessions from Russia, even when the offer was accompanied by every kind of insult and provocation, and that they rose, not because they obtained reforms, but because the reforms were given with one hand and taken away with the other—because they were treated at one moment like a civilized and intelligent nation, at another, like the savage subjects of an African king—because their national feelings were insulted, and relief seemed to be coming to them from abroad. In Posen and Galicia the desire of independence is not less strong than in the kingdom; yet Polish deputies sit in the Prussian Parliament and the Galician Diet, and the Poseners and Galicians live peacefully, if not contentedly, under the rule of those Germans whom they are said to detest even more than the Russians. The duties of the Emperor Alexander towards the Poles of Russian Poland are, to say nothing of treaties, the same as those of every other ruler towards his subjects. No sophistical arguments can excuse the horrible condition to which the Poles under Russia are now reduced; their estates constantly impoverished by ruinous contributions, their best and most respectable citizens in banishment, their religion persecuted and derided, and their only Government a brutal and capricious tyranny. Such a state of things is a disgrace to Russia, and it cannot be her interest to maintain it.

---

* "Correspondence relating to the Negotiations of the years 1814 and 1815 respecting Poland. Presented to the House of Commons by command of Her Majesty. 1863."

† Lord Castlereagh based this demand on the following ground: "In order to obviate, as far as possible, such consequences" (*i.e.*, the disturbance of the tranquillity of the North and the general equilibrium of Europe,) "*it is of essential importance to establish the public tranquillity throughout the territories which formerly constituted the kingdom of Poland* upon some solid and liberal basis of common interest, by applying to all, however various may be their political institutions, *a congenial and conciliatory system of administration.*"

ART. VII.—DR. LIVINGSTONE'S RECENT TRAVELS.

Narrative of an Expedition to the Zambesi and its Tributaries, and of the Discovery of the Lakes Shirwa and Nyassa, 1858-64. By DAVID and CHARLES LIVINGSTONE. With Map and Illustrations. 1865.

THE expedition, of which the present volume of Dr. Livingstone's travels gives an account, was, as it were, a flank movement against the slave-trade on the East Coast of Africa, such as had already been made on its Western. The success in the latter case is reported to have been great. Piracy and the slave-trade were extinguished, and lawful commerce was increased from an annual total of £20,000 in ivory and gold-dust, to above two millions, one million of which was in palm-oil to England. Twelve thousand pupils were to be found in the schools attached to the twenty missions which had been established, and life and property were rendered secure along the coast. Such, according to Dr. Livingstone's own observation, has been the effect of what is called "Lord Palmerston's policy," that, namely, of endeavouring to excite a demand for legitimate commerce, and thus of extinguishing the slave-trade. But the chief advantage expected on this occasion, as declared in the instructions of her Majesty's Government, was from the "moral influence that might be exerted on the minds of the natives by a well-regulated and orderly household to all who might witness it; treating the people with kindness and relieving their wants; teaching them to make experiments in agriculture; explaining to them the more simple arts; imparting to them religious instruction as far as they are capable of receiving it, and inculcating peace and goodwill to each other." To carry out this purpose, the expedition left England on the 10th of March, 1858, in her Majesty's steamer *Pearl*, and after touching at Capetown made its way to the East Coast the following May, for the purpose of exploring the Zambesi, and determining its capacity for being turned into a commercial highway into the interior of the country. The first difficulty was to find which of the four mouths through which the river mingles with the ocean, that is, the Milambe, or, one most to the west, the Kongone, Luabo, and the Timbwe (or Muselo) would furnish the easiest access to it. For though the Portuguese Government assumes a power over 1360 miles of coast from English river to Cape Delgado, and interdicts all foreign commerce, except at a very few few points, they were quite in the dark respecting the entrance to this important river. After an unsuccessful attempt up the Luawe, which turned out to be not a branch, a careful examination showed that the Kongone, five miles to the eastward of the Milambe, promised to be the best entrance. They therefore proceeded to ascend the stream through this mouth. It is so difficult to shake off our early impressions respecting the general character of Africa; our tendency to regard it as anything but a wilderness of sun-scorched lifeless sand, with its occasional but rare oases—supplying water to wayfarers and metaphors to poets—that we have a feeling of strangeness while following the travellers along an African river, with its banks rank with luxuriant vegetation or bordered by mountains covered with verdure and forests to their very tops. Thus, for the first twenty miles of the Kongone, the river passes through a mangrove jungle. Then follow ferns and date-palms, and clusters of the tall pandanus, or screw-palm, tapering up in the distance, and having so much the appearance of steeples as to draw from an old sailor the sympathetic though unpicturesque remark, that but one thing was wanting to complete the picture—"*a grog-shop near the church.*" As the river is ascended it winds through vast plains covered with gigantic grasses, towering above a man's head, which are burnt off every July after they become dry. Here and there, peeping out from bananas and cocoa-palms, are native huts, built upon piles driven into the damp ground, and entered by ladders. Large crops of rice, sweet potatoes, pumpkins, tomatoes, cabbage, shalots, peas, with a little cotton and some sugar-cane, are to be found. It is the opinion of Dr. Livingstone that this district, extending from the Kongone Canal—a natural canal running from the Kongone to Quillimane along the coast—to beyond Mazaro, about eighty miles in length and fifty in width, is so well suited to the growth of the sugar-cane that, were it in the hands of the people at the Cape, it would furnish *sugar enough for the supply of Europe.* The few inhabitants seen seemed tolerably well fed and scantily clothed, showed no fear of the white man, and appeared anxious to establish a trade, offering their fowls, and baskets of rice and meal, shouting out, "Malonda! malonda!"—"Things for sale." No difficulty presented itself in the navigation until reaching the Isle of Simbo, when the *Pearl's* draught proving too great, she was dismissed, after first discharging the goods of the expedition on a grassy island about forty miles from the bar. They had henceforth to depend upon a small steam-launch brought from England in three sections on the deck of the *Pearl*, and which was christened *Ma-Robert*, after Mrs. Livingstone, whom the natives formerly styled "Ma-mother of her eldest son." Here part of the expedition was employed in carrying the goods up to Shupanga and Senna, the rest remaining on the island from the 18th of June to the 13th of August. Fever now began to touch some of them, while others found time to grumble for Sunday rest and full meal hours, which draws from Dr. Livingstone the very sensible remark:—"It is a pity some people cannot see that the true and honest discharge of the common duties of every-day life is Divine service." On nearing Mazaro they found the country in a state of disturbance, the Portuguese being at war with Mariano, a half-caste, a keen slave-hunter, sending out armed parties among the tribes of the North-east, and conveying the captives in chains to Quillimane, to his brother-in-law, who shipped them as "free" emigrants to the French island of Bourbon. He seems to have been a rare scoundrel, who, for the purpose of creating ter-

ror, amused himself with spearing captives with his own hands, and is said on one occasion to have destroyed in this way forty unfortunates standing in a row before him. The party, coming into contact with a number of the well-armed "rebels," were at first sharply challenged, but on declaring themselves English were at once treated with great friendliness and respect. They soon after reached Mazaro, where a battle had been going on, while the crew were taking in wood at a distance of only a mile, of which they heard nothing, owing to a dense fog; and on landing, to see some of his old Portuguese friends, Dr. Livingstone found himself in the midst of the wounded and slain. He was even exposed to some danger; for the governor being ill of fever, and desirous of removal to Shupanga, he gave his arm to the sufferer just as the fight was resumed and the balls were beginning to whistle in all directions.

The explorers now began to feel the full inconvenience of the villanous boat which had been constructed for them. Its furnaces were so bad that it required four hours to get up the steam, and caused a great loss of time in wood cutting. The pace of the *Asthmatic*, as she was nicknamed, was so slow that she could only keep pace with the heavy-laden canoes, and was easily outsped by the light ones. Being unable to get up to Senna on account of a shoal, they walked across the country, and met on their way men armed with spears, bows, or muskets, and women carrying hoes on their way to work, all extremely civil, stepping aside, "the men bowing and scraping, and the women, even with heavy loads on their heads, curtseying." "A curtsey," adds the Doctor, "from bare legs, is startling!" We should think so too; we wonder how they came by it. The two leading features of Senna, a Portuguese convict settlement, are said to be the certainty of taking fever there on the second day, if it is escaped on the first, and the presence of a most hospitable and benevolent gentleman, whose generosity to the natives when in any kind of trouble is munificent. To the residents, the fever, we presume, can be no objection, if we may judge by the fact that when the Portuguese Government, on the discovery of the Kongone, proposed to remove the inhabitants of Quillimane, a fever-stricken place, to a new town near the bar of that stream, they declared they would resign all offices rather than go there. At length the ship anchored off Tette on the 8th of September, 1858, where Dr. Livingstone's old companions and servants the Makololo received him again with great joy. This Tette, which is a Portuguese station, is a miserable place on the right bank of the Zambesi here 960 yards wide. The houses are built on the ridges of shallow ravines parallel with the river, which form the streets, and are, with the exception of their narrow footpaths, overgrown with self-sown indigo, three or four feet high, and also with the senna plant. Curious to see the Kebrabasa rapids while the water of the Zambesi would allow of their being seen uncovered, the party set out and reached them on the 9th of November. The approach to them was through a singularly wild scene, the stream passing between huge blocks of granite of a pinkish tinge and metamorphic rocks twisted into every possible position, and flowing, in this, the dry season, at the bottom of a "narrow and deep groove, whose sides are polished and fluted by the boiling action of the water in flood, like the rims of ancient Eastern wells by the draw-ropes." The masts of the steamboat, thirty feet high, did not reach to the level of the flood water-line, while no bottom was found at ten fathoms. Having explored about ten miles of the rapids they were obliged to give it up, and returned to get provisions and make a new attempt on foot from the point they were stopped at. After some days of extreme toil, either clambering over huge boulders, so hot as to blister the feet of the Makololo, at the rate of a mile an hour, or forcing their way over slopes of mountains through dense thorn-bush with such dogged perseverance as to beget a notion in the minds of some of the native followers that their leader was mad, they were able to ascertain that the river was navigable only during the highest floods, when it rises eighty feet perpendicularly. After a complete survey of the Kebrabasa they returned to Tette. On their arrival, they heard that in consequence of the river's rising a foot and becoming turbid, a native Portuguese had with much anxiety said to the governor, "That Englishman is doing something to the river;" which sapient remark is given as a fair sample of the ignorance and superstition common to the inhabitants of Tette.

It being found impossible for a vessel of so little power as their steamer to force its way up the river, an application was made to Government for another vessel, and meanwhile Dr. Livingstone determined to explore the Shire, which flows into the Zambesi from the north at about a hundred miles from the sea. From all that could be learnt, this river had never been explored by any European. A vague impression existed that a Portuguese had attempted to ascend it and been foiled by impenetrable masses of duckweed, or, as some knowingly hinted, by the poisoned arrows of the natives. In January, 1859, the expedition entered the Shire, and for the first twenty-five miles met with a good deal of the formidable duckweed, but not in sufficient amount to impede even the lightest canoe. The lower part of the river had a depth of two fathoms, and though shallower higher up, it was found, from the absence of sand-banks, of easy navigation. After winding up the river for 200 miles, equivalent to 100 in a straight line, their progress was arrested, in 5° 55′ south, by some superb cataracts, which, as a tribute to a distinguished name and in grateful remembrance of kind services rendered, they called "The Murchison." As the natives kept watch on the river banks, it was deemed imprudent to land; Dr. Livingstone therefore determined to return to Tette. In the middle of March of the same year he again set out on a trip to the Shire. The natives, it seems, but for what reason is not told us, were this time friendly, bringing rice, corn, and fowls for sale. The party now determined on a land excursion, leaving their boat anchored

off a village about ten miles below the cataract, belonging to a native chief, Chibisa. This chief is described as a shrewd, intelligent person, who had a high idea of his office, for, as he told Dr. Livingstone, on succeeding to the chieftainship he was but an ordinary man, but immediately on that event "he was conscious of power passing into his head and down his back." The Doctor remarks that he mentioned this as he would any fact in natural history. We believe this phenomenon to be common enough among the civilized, and we have met in our time more than one person whose back has become considerably stiffer when the sense of newly-acquired authority had got into his head. Taking with them a number of the Makololo, Drs. Livingstone and Kirk set out on foot in quest of Lake Shirwa. After being awhile misled by ignorant guides, they mended matters by putting themselves under the care of crazy ones, the "madmen" of the different villages, who, either through sympathy with them, from hearing them styled, like themselves, mad, or from the absence of any feeling of aversion to them as strangers, faithfully guided them where no native in his senses could be induced to go. At length, on the 18th of April, they came in sight of Lake Shirwa, an expanse of bitter water filled with fish, crocodiles, hippopotami, and leeches, the last of which so abounded that when they attempted to wade to a sand-bank, they were so formidably assailed by these creatures as to be forced to return. It was now thought they had done enough for one trip, their object being rather to gain the confidence of the natives than to explore; and having found the good policy of a second visit on the Shire, Dr. Livingstone, reserving his researches for another trip, returned to Tette, which he reached on the 23rd of June; and after some repairs to his vessel, proceeded to Kongone to receive provisions from one of her Majesty's cruisers. Here the unfortunate *Ma-Robert* was beached, when it was discovered that the patent steel plates of which she was built were in a state of decomposition. By some chemical action a minute hole had been made in each, from which branches, like little stars seen in thawing ice, radiated in all directions, converting themselves into holes, until the bottom became like a fine sieve. The vessel, indeed, was a perfect swindle, and though patched up as well as possible, was a serious hamper to the expedition as long as they used her. Passing up the Zambesi, they again ascended the Shire, with the intention of establishing closer relations with the natives, and making another journey on foot to the north of Lake Shirwa, in search of Lake Nyassa, or, as it was sometimes called, Nyenyesi, that is, "the stars." The Shire, less wide, is of a greater depth than the Zambesi, and more easily navigated; for the first twenty miles the banks are hemmed in by hills, terminated by the Morambala, that is, the "Lofty Watch Tower," a detached mountain rising steeply up 500 yards from the river's brink to a height of 4000 feet, beautifully wooded to the top. Beyond this mountain, which extends seven miles in length, the Shire runs through an immense marsh, at the end of which it borders a vast forest of palm-trees for many miles; the country then becomes again more elevated. On the 25th, they reached Dakanamoio island, opposite the steep bluff on which Chibisa's village stands. Leaving the ship, they set off with a party forty-two in number—four of themselves, thirty-six Makololo, and two guides, on the 27th of August, 1859, on their way to Lake Nyassa, which they reached on the 16th of September following. Staying but a short time at the Lake, Dr. Livingstone again had recourse to his favourite policy of a second visit; and he and his friends returned to the ship, reaching it, after a land journey of forty days, in a bad plight, either from an overdose of mullagatawny in their soup, or more probably from the injudicious way in which their cook had prepared the cassava root, and by which the poisonous matter in it was not thoroughly extracted.

Dr. Livingstone had now been a year in the country, passing and re-passing to and from various points, without having had much personal intercourse with the natives. In this excursion, however, to Lake Nyassa, some opportunity presented itself. In traversing the Manganja hills he found the people generally living in villages, the sites of which were judiciously selected near to flowing streams, in the midst of shady trees, and enclosed by impenetrable hedges of poisonous euphorbia, which has the double advantage of casting so deep a shade as to protect the villagers from the aim of hostile bow-men, and of killing the grass beneath it, thus preventing its being set fire to and communicating with the huts. At the entrance of each is the *boalo*, or "spreading place," about thirty yards wide, over-shadowed by trees, where the men sit working during the day, smoking tobacco and bang, or singing, dancing, and beer drinking, on moonlight nights. This, too, is the reception place for strangers; their arrival being reported to the chief, he either comes, or, if suspicious, waits till his warriors are collected, when "he makes his appearance," and then—

> "All the people begin to clap their hands in unison, and continue doing so until he sits down opposite to us. His counsellors take their places beside him. He makes a remark or two, and is then silent for a few seconds. Our guides then sit down in front of the chief and his counsellors, and both parties lean forward, looking earnestly at each other; the chief repeats a word, such as 'Ambuiatu' (our father or master), or 'Moio' (life), and all clap their hands. Another word is followed by two claps, a third by still more clapping, when each touches the ground with both hands placed together. Then all rise, and lean forward with measured clap, and sit down again with clap, clap, clap, fainter and still fainter, till the last dies away, or is brought to an end by a smart loud clap from the chief. They keep perfect time in this species of court etiquette."—pp. 109, 110.

This imposing ceremony over, the conference begins, which is always conducted through spokesmen on either side; the chief rarely holding direct communication with the head of the visiting party. It is much to be regretted that

we are not furnished with the matter of some one of these conferences which would serve as a clue to the intelligence and impressions of the natives. The Manganja are described as industrious, cultivating largely, and also working in iron, cotton, and basket-making. The produce of the district is of great variety,—large crops of mapira, together with millet, beans, and ground-nuts; patches of yams, rice, pumpkins, cucumbers, cassava, sweet potatoes, tobacco, and hemp or bang; maize, too, and cotton, are largely grown. Of the latter the *tonje manga*, or foreign cotton, evidently an importation, from its name, has been considered in this country as equal to the best New Orleans; it is a perennial, but requires transplanting once in three years. Most families at all well off have a small patch, from an acre to half an acre, which is cultivated with great care. The *tonje cadja*, or indigenous cotton, is shorter in the staple, and has a woolly feel, but as it makes stronger cloth is preferred by the natives. Everywhere,

"We met with it, and scarcely entered a village without finding a number of men cleaning, spinning, and weaving. It is first carefully separated from the seed by the fingers, or by an iron roller, on a little block of wood, and rove out into long soft bands without twist; then it receives its first twist in the spindle, and becomes about the thickness of coarse candle-wick. After being taken off and wound into a large ball, it is given the final hard twist, and spun into a firm cop on the spindle again, all the processes being painfully slow."

The staple trade of the southern highlands, in which the iron ore is found, is the manufacture of various iron implements or ornaments, axes, spears, needles, arrow-heads, bracelets and anklets. Every village is described as having its smelting-house, charcoal-burners, and blacksmiths. The iron is well worked up, and not dear, a hoe over two pounds in weight being exchanged for calico about the value of fourpence. Nor have we yet exhausted the industrial occupations of the Manganja. In the villages near Lake Shirwa there is a considerable manufacture, literally *manu*facture, of pottery, such as cooking, water, and grain pots, which they ornament with plumbago; others, again, weave baskets with split bamboos, or make fish-nets out of the fibre of the buaze found upon the hills, which are exchanged with fishermen for dried fish and salt. The villages keep up a brisk trade with each other in tobacco, salt, dried fish, skins, and iron. This varied industrial activity, so skilfully developed, is certainly very surprising, and is the more so, when we come to learn that the Manganja are anything but a sober people. It appears they brew large quantities of beer, and having no hops or other means of checking fermentation, they are obliged to drink it off as fast as possible to prevent its spoiling. Night and day at this time they go on drinking, drumming, dancing, until the stock is gone; whole villages were found enjoying themselves in this way, and the "veteran traveller" of the party declared he had never met "so much drunkenness during all the sixteen years he had spent in Africa." This beverage is of a pinkish colour, and is produced by drying the grain which has been made to vegetate in the sun, then pounding it into meal, and gently boiling it until it acquires the consistency of gruel. It has a sweet taste with a slight acidity, and is described as a most grateful beverage, immediately quenching thirst. It is only by long and deep potations that it becomes intoxicating, and even then it seems to produce no bad results on the health of the natives. It is true there is a good deal of skin disease among them, but this may be explained by the saying of an old man, that he remembered having once washed in his life, but so long since he had forgotten when; and by the question put by a woman to one of the Makololo, "Why do you wash? our men never do." Some cases of men pitted with small-pox were found, and on inquiring of a fuddled old chief how he thought the disease had got there, he courteously replied, in his desire to be complimentary, he "supposed it must have come from the English." The Manganja men are described as intelligent looking, with *well-shaped* heads, agreeable faces, and high foreheads, occasionally bearing a resemblance to Englishmen, acquaintances of the party. They lavish much pains upon their persons, twisting their hair sometimes into the shape of buffalo's horns, sometimes coiling it down their backs like an animal's tail, or putting it up in twisted cords, stiffened by winding round each fillets of the inner part of a tree, and thus making the cords radiate from the head in all directions. Occasionally the head is partially shaved, so as to represent ornamental figures. The people of both sexes are covered with ornaments of brass, copper, or iron, either as rings on fingers or thumbs, or as bracelets, throatlets, and anklets. The women are disfigured by that artificial stretching and projection of the upper lip, which is called the pelele.

The following is the description of this hideous appendage:—

"But the most wonderful of ornaments, if such it may be called, is the pelele, or upper-lip ring of the women (occasionally, as on the banks of the Rovuma, worn by men). The middle of the upper lip of the girls is pierced close to the septum of the nose, and a small pin inserted to prevent the puncture closing up. After it has healed, the pin is taken out, and a larger one is pressed into its place; and so on, successively for weeks, and months, and years. The process of increasing the size of the lip goes on till its capacity becomes so great that a ring of two inches diameter can be introduced with ease. All the highland women wear the pelele, and it is common on the Upper and Lower Shire. The poorer classes make them of hollow or solid bamboo, but the wealthier of ivory or tin. The tin pelele is often made in the form of a small dish; the ivory one is not unlike a napkin-ring. No woman ever appears in public without the pelele, except in times of mourning for the dead. It is frightfully ugly to see the upper lip projecting two inches beyond the tip of the nose. When an old wearer of a hollow bamboo rings smiles, by the action of the muscles of the cheeks, the ring and lip outside it are dragged back and thrown above the eyebrows; the nose is seen through the middle of the ring, and the exposed teeth show how carefully they have been chipped to look like those of a cat or crocodile."—p. 114.

The travellers were less well received by the Manganja than by the tribes on the Zambesi, it being more difficult to convince them that the object was not slave-dealing. Some villages they were not allowed to enter, nor would the inhabitants sell them food. This looked natural enough, as they had now come in contiguity with one of the great slave paths into the interior, and in actual contact with a slave party that offered them children for sale. It appears, however, the Manganja chiefs lend themselves to this traffic, though seeming or affecting to be ashamed when questioned. In exchange for rings, pottery, and sometimes handsome young women, and especially cloth, which is the circulating medium of the country, they connive at their people being stolen away at night. The general prices are four yards of cotton cloth for a man, three for a woman, and two for a boy or girl. They are carried off to the Portuguese at Mosambique, Iboe, and Quillimane. But that the chiefs need not be very nice on this point is obvious from the fact that sometimes one portion of a clan will lay hold upon another, and steal and sell them into slavery. Such are the great and unintelligible contrasts among the Manganja, a highly industrious, agricultural, manufacturing population, exhibiting much skill with very deficient means, and yet addicted to drunkenness, and selling each other into slavery.

The interval between Dr. Livingstone's getting back to the ship in October, 1859, and May 15th, 1860, was consumed in making two voyages to Kongone; the one to receive supplies, which had run short, from her Majesty's ship *Lynx*, and the second to recover some mail-bags, which had been swamped in coming ashore from that vessel, and were subsequently thrown up on the beach. After returning a second time to Tette, preparations were made for the land journey in contemplation, the object of which was to re-convey the faithful Makololo to their native home, and to explore the Zambesi. The party, on the 15th of May, left Tette and again made their way to the Kebrabasa. Fording the Luia, they left the banks of the Zambesi, and struck off in a north-west direction till they reached the little village of Sindabwe; and then, winding up south-west through the lovely valley of Zibah, made their way to Sandia village. Here they were well received, and could purchase plenty of provisions. In this region, the Mapira—which is the Kaffir and Guinea corn of the south and west—the dura of Egypt and the badjery of India—is the "corn" of the country: its grain is round, white or reddish-white, and of the size of a hempseed. It springs up to a height of from eight to eighteen feet on a stalk as thick as a walking-stick, topped by a massive ear containing several hundred grains. During the halt in this place an elephant was shot by some of the men, which seems to have been a cause of great excitement. They danced round her, with shouts and songs of triumph, and when they proceeded to cut the animal up a singular spectacle presented itself.

"The men," says Dr. Livingstone, "stand round the animal in dead silence, while the chief of the travelling party declares that, according to ancient law, the head and right hind leg belong to him who killed the beast—that is, to him who inflicted the first wound; the left leg to him who delivered the second, or first touched the animal after it fell; the meat round the eye to the English, or chief of the travellers, and different parts to the head men of the different fires or groups of which the camp is composed; not forgetting to enjoin the preservation of the fat and bowels for a second distribution. This oration finished, the natives soon become excited, and scream wildly as they cut away at the carcase with a score of spears, whose long handles quiver in the air above their heads. Their excitement becomes momentarily more and more intense, and reaches the culminating point when, as denoted by a roar of gas, the huge mass is laid fairly open. Some jump inside and roll about there in their eagerness to seize the precious fat, while others run off, screaming, with pieces of the bloody meat, throw it on the grass, and run back for more: all keep talking and shouting at the utmost pitch of their voices. Sometimes two or three, regardless of all laws, seize the same piece of meat, and have a brief fight of words over it. Occasionally an agonized yell bursts forth, and a native emerges out of the moving mass of dead elephant and wriggling humanity, with his hand badly cut by the spear of his excited friend and neighbour; this requires a rag and some soothing words to prevent bad blood. In an incredibly short time tons of meat are cut up, and placed in separate heaps around."—p. 160.

Though this mode of having one's meat prepared was not likely to give a great spur to appetite, yet the next morning, when the elephant's forefoot was served up to Dr. Livingstone and his friends at breakfast, in the shape of a "whitish mass slightly glutinous, and sweet like marrow, it was pronounced delicious." The cooking was simple enough; the foot having been plunged into a hole previously well heated and covered over with hot ashes and earth surmounted by a good fire kept alive throughout the night, was ready to be served. It appears the trunk and tongue, after being long simmered, are also delicacies, resembling the hump of a buffalo and the tongue of an ox; but the rest of the meat is tough and disagreeable, which, however, did not prevent the men from consuming it in enormous quantities, boiled and roast—eating, dancing, singing, sleeping, cooking; in fact, one round of "boil and eat, roast and devour," with snatches of sleep all the night long. Dr. Livingstone pays a compliment to the skill of his cooks, with the exception of their porridge-making, at which his Scotch blood rises, their process being merely to warm and moisten the meal without boiling it, and to serve it in an almost solid mass. Sandia, an elderly person, made his appearance, wearing a wig, black and extremely glossy, made of the fibre of the Ife (*Sanseviera*), a plant allied to the aloes, whose thick, fleshy leaves being bruised, afford a strong fibre, which is made into ropes, nets, and wigs. From the back of his neck was suspended the mosamela, or small carved wooden pillow, exactly like the ancient Egyptian one, which, together with a sleeping-mat, is carried by natives on their hunting excursions. The chief on their departure gave them guides. They pushed on for the Chicova plains—after inspecting the whole of Kebrabasa, and again

satisfying themselves that all navigation was impossible, except at high-flood—which they reached on the 7th of June, 1860. These plains, consisting of rich black soil, formerly contained a numerous population, which has been nearly extirpated by wars and slaving. Cotton still mingles with the weeds of the ruined villages. They had now come into the country of lions, which required certain precautions to be taken in the arrangement of the camp and the distribution of the fires. The nights being cold, the men went to bed in a peculiar fashion by plunging themselves into *jumbas*, or sleeping-bags, made of double rectangular mats of palm-leaf six feet by four, with an opening at the top, and thus presented the appearance of a number of sacks scattered about the camp. Neither cold, wet, nor mosquitoes can annoy them under these coverings.

At Chicova they found a seam of coal cropping out on the banks of the Zambesi, the properties of which were explained to the natives, who, on hearing them, shook their heads, and with an incredulous smile, replied, "Kodi!"—that is, "Really!" There was every evidence of their being on an immense coal-field. In passing through the country they found that two miles and a-half an hour in a straight line was a sufficient pace, and five or six hours a sufficient day's march. This, Dr. Livingstone says, is quite as much as a man can comfortably do. The Europeans, it appears, even in the tropics, have a greater power of endurance than the most hardy of the meat-eating Africans, and, in point of fact, after the day's march the gentlemen of the expedition were obliged to go and shoot game for the camp, in which the men were very loth to assist them. This trouble was occasionally saved by their falling in with hippopotami, playing about in the water, which are easily shot. Much large game is taken in the neighbourhood of the Sinjére by means of pits lined with sharp stakes, covered with earth, into which the heavier kind of game falls, and is impaled. It is a curious proof of sagacity that neither elephants nor buffaloes will return to the river for two successive nights by the same path for fear of being trapped; and an old elephant is often seen in advance of the herd uncovering the pits for the security of his party. Passing through plains varying in breadth as the woods approach or recede from the river, covered with open forest, displaying belts of grass, varying in colour from green to yellow, according to the season of the year, in sight of superb mountains from 2000 to 3000 feet in height, their tops fringed with trees, and then through a country to all appearances solitary, but abounding in animal life, they on the 26th of June reached Zumbo, on the left bank of the Loangwa, formerly a Portuguese settlement. Near the ruins of some houses they observed the remains of an old chapel, with a church-bell lying near it. Soon after leaving this place, they quitted the river and proceeded to the Mohango Pass. Though the nights here were so cold that on the 30th of June the thermometer marked only 39° at sunrise, they were horribly pestered by *tsetse* flies buzzing about their heads in greater numbers than they had ever before observed. This venomous insect falls so delicately on the skin that you have no notion of its presence till its proboscis is thrust into you; the pain, however, is soon over, leaving a little itching behind it; but to all other animals, except men, goats, and donkeys, their bite is fatal. The time of grass-burning having begun, they had the opportunity of witnessing miles of country on fire. They frequently fell in with families moving in file from place to place, the father at the head, leading, carrying nothing but his arms, his sons armed too, but with loads, the wife and daughters heavily burdened with household gear on their heads. In the chiefs of several of the villages Dr. Livingstone recognised some of his old acquaintances. After leaving the river (July 14th) at a point where the mountain ranges form the Kariba gorge, they passed into the fertile country of a tribe of Batoka called Bawe — a kind, hospitable people, among whom many are known as the "Baenda-pezi," or *Go Naked*s, their only covering being a coating of red-ochre. The Doctor and his friends endeavoured to shame them by laughter out of this habit, but all in vain, "as they evidently felt no less decent than we did with our clothes on." Of the custom, they could give no explanation. The men carry large shields of buffalo-hide and heavy spears, but, at all events, have the good sense not to use them in their quarrels with each other. The Batoka, to which the Bawe belong, are said to be the only tribe that plants, and does not cut down fruit trees, and that has permanent graveyards, which are placed either on the side of hills or under old trees. They pay respect to their ancestral tombs either by placing the largest elephant tusk they can get at the head of the grave, or else encasing it in the finest ivory. Dr. Livingstone supposes they believe in the continued existence of the soul, and that the spirits of the defunct are affected pleasantly or painfully by the good or evil deeds of those they have left behind. They practise ordeal by the poison of the muave.

Near the confluence of the Kafue they met with the manbo, or chief, together with some of his head men, all with a very downcast air, and having their foreheads smeared with white flour; they had just before purged themselves of a charge of witchcraft by swallowing the muave, which having vomited up, they were declared not guilty. These Batoka are an industrious people: they erect numerous granaries in their villages, and tie up quantities of grain into bundles with grass well plastered over with mud, which, on the subsidence of the Zambesi, they place on low sand islands, to protect them as much as possible from mice and men. It appears that the ravages of the weevil are such that it is impossible to preserve the crop until the following one comes in; what is not consumed is made into beer, that is drunk in large quantities, in spite of which cases of intoxication are rare. They grow a great deal of tobacco, and are said to be the most inveterate smokers in the world. For the edification of amateurs, and possibly as an in-

ducement to settlers, we quote the following passage:—

"The pipe is seldom out of their mouths, and they are as polite smokers as any ever met with in a railway carriage; . . . always asking if we had any objection to their smoking beside us. They think that they have invented an improved method of smoking; a description of which may interest those who are fond of the weed at home. They take a whiff, puff out the grosser smoke, then, by a sudden inhalation, contrive to catch and swallow, as they say, the real essence—the spirit which, in the ordinary way, is entirely lost. The Batoka tobacco is famed in the country for its strength, and is certainly both very strong and cheap; a few strings of beads will purchase enough to last any reasonable man for six months. It caused headache in the only smoker of our party from its strength, but this quality makes the natives come great distances to buy it."—p. 239.

Above Kariba the country had as yet been unvisited by strangers, and Dr. Livingstone had now the painful mortification of discovering that this first and friendly invasion of it was likely to prove a curse. It came to his ears that two native Portuguese scoundrels, who had murdered a chief at Zumbo and taken possession of his lands, were dogging the expedition, declaring themselves to be its "children," purchasing ivory from the Bawe for a few coarse beads, a tusk, as well as canoes to carry it, for half a dozen strings of beads or two fathoms of calico each; including in their purchases a number of good-looking girls at the same rate. Dr. Livingtone does not hesitate to charge the Portuguese Government with conniving at this rascality.

On the 9th of August, 1860, they reached the Victoria Falls, which Dr. Livingstone visited for a couple of days in 1855—accompanied by Sekeletu and his 200 men;—being the first European who had ever seen them. In the opinion of Mr. Charles Livingstone, they were much finer than Niagara, though not seen in all their majesty, as the river was now at its lowest. The causes of the formation of the two falls are very different. Those of Niagara are formed by the wearing away of the rock, whereas the Victoria, or, as the Makololo call it, "Mosioa-tunya" or "smoke sounding"—have been caused by some tremendous convulsion, producing a rift across the basaltic rock which forms the bed of the river. The depth of this perpendicular rift is, as nearly as could be ascertained, 360 feet to the water below; its mean width slightly above eighty yards. Into this vast fissure, running from east to west, twice the depth of Niagara, the river, a mile wide, falls with a tremendous roar. The convulsion which caused the transverse fissure, not having affected the level of the river-bed opposite the falls, has provided an escape for the river by another fissure, opening at right angles to the chasm, from between twenty to thirty yards wide, which continues for some time in convolutions nearly parallel with each other, through which the huge mass of water discharges itself, surging and rutfling along this deep, narrow, and sinuous trough. The portions of the ancient bed of the river intercepted between these convolutions are for the most part covered with trees, and have at their rounded angles the appearance of wooded promontories. But, in order to understand this peculiar formation and the aspect it presents, reference must be made to Dr. Livingstone's description, with the illustration annexed to it. To get an idea of the falls we must suppose ourselves standing on one of the foremost promontories facing the western end of the cataract, from which we should see, first, a fall of thirty-six yards in breadth, separated by a small island from a great fall of 573 yards broad, which is again separated by a projecting rock from a second grand fall; making in the whole a cataract 900 yards in breadth, with a depth of 360 feet. Over the sharp edge of the black basaltic rock the water pours down in an unbroken sheet to the depth of ten feet or so, when it assumes the appearance of a mass of driven snow, from which comet-shaped portions of water fly off "with tails streaming behind, till the whole snowy sheet becomes myriads of rushing, leaping, aqueous comets"—a peculiarity Dr. Livingstone attributes to the dryness of the atmosphere, noting that every drop of Zambesi water "seems to have an individuality, runs off the ends of the paddles, and glides in beads along the smooth surface like drops of quicksilver on a table; and. here we see them in a conglomeration, each with a train of pure white vapour, racing down until lost in clouds of spray." The immense volume of water carrying down with it a vast body of air into the unfathomed cleft in the river's bed, rushes up again, in from three to six columns, loaded with vapour, glowing with iridescent colours visible twenty miles off. On reaching a height of from 200 to 300 feet above the level of the falls, the vapour re-descends in the shape of the finest rain. A portion of this is showered upon Garden Island, which is in the middle of the river, near the lips of the fall, and only to be approached when the river is very low. It was here that, in 1855, Dr. Livingstone formed the garden from which the island takes its name, planting in it orange trees and sowing cashew-nuts and coffee-seeds. The hippopotami, as he feared and as he found, had completely destroyed the plants. They were renewed on this occasion, and though protected by a strong hedge, they have, according to the report of Sir Richard Glyn, who visited the Falls in 1863, met a similar fate. Wherever there is anything remarkable to see there will always be an Englishman to see it, and, accordingly, Dr. Livingstone found on the spot a Mr. Baldwin, a gentleman from Natal, who had made his way to the Falls by the means of a pocket-compass. He was not, however, at this moment a free Briton, having been impounded by Mashotlane, the representative of Sekeletu in this district, for jumping out of the boat in which he was being ferried over the river, and swimming to shore. Had he been eaten by crocodiles," said Mashotlane, "we should have been blamed for his death, and so he must pay a fine." The temptation of the fine, it is to be feared, suggested the scruple; and so Mr. Baldwin was held in pledge until he could have communication with

his waggons. Of course, he was now at once released. In this country, where beads are so acceptable, the surface of the ground for miles above the Falls is strewn with agates.

From the Falls, Dr. Livingstone proceeded to the village of Sesheke, where he was hospitably received. Sekeletu, the chief of the Makololo, who was living at a little distance suffering from leprosy, refused at first to see anyone but the Doctor, who was, however, finally permitted to visit him in company with his two friends. The most exaggerated accounts were afloat respecting the effects of the disease which had distorted his face, so it was said, while his fingers had become like eagle's claws; whereas, in fact, his face was only a little disfigured by the thickening of the skin at certain points; and though his nails were extremely long, "they were but slightly in excess of what is in fashion among Makololo gentlemen." He was found to be a sensible person of unassuming manners, his weak point being the conviction of his suffering from witchcraft. The native doctors had given him up, and an old doctress had undertaken the case, making seclusion a *sine qui non*. By the application of lunar caustic externally, and hydriodate of potash inwardly—the only medicines at their command—Drs. Kirk and Livingstone effected considerable improvement. The skin became thinner, the face ceased to be disfigured, and the general health and spirits of the patient improved.

This success would be much admired by the natives, for

"Like other Africans, the Makololo have great faith in the power of medicine; they believe that there is an especial medicine for every ill that flesh is heir to. Mamire is anxious to have children; he has six wives, and only one boy; and he begs earnestly for 'child medicine.' The mother of Sekeletu came from the Barotse valley to see her son; thinks she has lost flesh since Dr. Livingstone was here before, and asks for 'the medicine of fatness.'"—p. 295.

While at Sesheke they received the tidings of the fate of the London missionaries, Mr. and Mrs. Helmore, who, with several of their people, had fallen victims to fever. The expedition, after a month's stay in this place, set out on its return to Tette in canoes, taking with them two of the Makololo with their Bakoto servants, who were to bring back medicine for Sekeletu; but the latter, when they got down into the lower country, finding themselves independent, refused to return, and their two masters it seems could not contrive to get back without them. It looks very much as if they were faithless fellows. Four years after this Sekeletu died. On the 23rd of November the expedition again reached Tette, after an absence of six months, having met with a sad accident on the Kebrabasa rapids, where Dr. Kirk's canoe was upset, himself in great danger, and his notes of the journey, and botanical drawings, together with his chronometer and barometer, were swept away and entirely lost. On the 3rd of December they were again off for Kongone, in the *Asthmatic*, which, after threatening daily to founder, was good enough to ground on a sand-bank, from which she could not be removed. They saved, however, the greater part of their property and went on by canoe to Senna. Here they fell in with a native Portuguese trader, Sequasha, who had more than once crossed their path, and among whose followers were two men who had murdered one of the native chiefs. He had brought down with him more than 25,000 lbs. of ivory, purchased for a mere song; his partner about half that amount. On his return to Tette the following year this vagabond was imprisoned, on account of his misconduct in the interior; but after squeezing out of him some tons of ivory, he was let loose for further mischief. At Kongone they found that a flag-staff and custom-house had been erected, and left in charge of a black lance-corporal and three privates, who were nearly starved out. The expedition was itself in a sad lack of stores, when, on the 31st of January, 1861, their new ship, the *Pioneer*, and at the same time two English ships of war arrived, bringing Bishop Mackenzie, and the Oxford and Cambridge Mission to the tribes of the Shire and Lake Nyassa, consisting of six Englishmen, and five coloured men from the Cape. The bishop was ready to proceed at once to his work, but as the *Pioneer* was under orders to explore the Rovuma, it was thought better that the bishop should send the other members of his mission to the island of Johanna, and himself accompany Dr. Livingstone. It might have been dangerous to have gone to his quarters at the beginning of the sickly season without a medical attendant, and without, in fact, medicine; for the fever pills bought by the bishop at the Cape turned out to be made of *dirt* instead of *drugs!* Really, when we think of Dr. Livingstone going to Christianize savages in a worthless vessel, made by a swindling Christian, and Bishop Mackenzie's dirt-pills, purchased from Christian vendors, we cannot help recalling to mind the answer of Tomo Chichi, an American Indian, to a missionary wishing to convert him: "Tomo Chichi, Christian? Christians at Savannah steal; Christians at Savannah drink; Christians at Savannah kill. No! no! Tomo Chichi, no Christian." We are reminded, too, of Rajah Brook's warning some years since, that it would be useless for missionaries to teach Christian dogmas while traders were exhibiting gross transgressions of Christian precepts. It seems natural that if we desire to Christianize a country by the means of trade, we should first Christianize the traders who are to deal with it.

In a magnificent bay, on the 25th of February, the *Pioneer* came to anchor, awaiting the arrival of the bishop, who was following in the *Lyra*. Two days afterwards, the party proceeded up the river. But now came a new difficulty. The *Pioneer*, unexceptionable in all other respects, had been designed to draw three feet of water, but unfortunately drew five! This was too much for the frequent shallows. They had now nothing to do but to return to the coast, and make their way up through the Zambesi into the Shire, which they effected with difficulty, having to haul the vessel over

the shallow places. After months thus thrown away, they arrived at Chibisa's, and started on the 5th of July, with a number of his men, for the highlands. They had heard, on their arrival, that the Manganja country was at war with the Awaja, who were sending marauding parties in all directions, and briskly carrying on the slave trade. On the morning of their second day's march, they had evidence of this in a way that eventually led to unpleasant results. Understanding that a slave party was on its way to Tette, and irritated at this horrible traffic, which had followed in the wake of their discoveries, they determined if possible to put a stop to it:—

"A few minutes after Mbame had spoken to us," says Dr. Livingstone, "a long line of manacled men, women, and children came wending their way round the hill and into the valley, on the side of which the village stood. The black drivers, armed with muskets and bedecked with various articles of finery, marched jauntily in the front, middle, and rear of the line; some of them blowing exultant notes out of long tin horns. They seemed to feel that they were doing a very noble thing, and might proudly march with an air of triumph; but the instant the fellows caught a glimpse of the English, they darted off like mad into the forest; so fast, indeed, that we caught but a glimpse of their red caps and the soles of their feet. The chief of the party alone remained; and he, from being in front, had his hand tightly grasped by a Makololo! He proved to be a well-known slave of the late commandant at Tette, and for some time our own attendant while there. On asking him how he obtained these captives, he replied, he had bought them; but on our inquiring of the people themselves, all, save four, said they had been captured in war. While this inquiry was going on, he bolted too. The captives knelt down, and, in their way of expressing thanks, clapped their hands with great energy. They were thus left entirely on our hands, and knives were soon busy at work cutting the women and children loose. It was more difficult to cut the men adrift, as each had his neck in the fork of a stout stick, six or seven feet long, and kept in by an iron rod, which was riveted at both ends across the throat. With a saw, luckily in the bishop's baggage, one by one the men were sawn out into freedom."—p. 356.

The bishop was bathing when this took place, and on his return, after some little hesitation, approved what had been done. It is not very clear how they could hope to stop the traffic thus begun by the liberation of a few captives, and though the sight was no doubt exceedingly painful to Dr. Livingstone, it was certainly during this expedition not a novel one, as on his return to Tette from the Makololo country he had met near the Luia two large trading parties with a number of Manganja women, all made fast by their necks to a long rope, which they were taking to Zumbo to sell for ivory. This act of liberation was afterwards a source of some annoyance to Dr. Livingstone. The bishop's warlike feeling seems to have been aroused by it; and when, in the course of their journey towards Lake Nyassa, and in search for a settlement for the University Mission, they found the villages in flames and the people of the country flying in panic, he was for attacking the Ajawa and sweeping them out of the country. Dr. Livingstone opposed this successfully, as being impolitic and useless; though he was naturally enough made responsible for some subsequent collisions with the natives which the bishop had when left to himself. After conducting the mission to Magomero, where it had been invited to take up its quarters by the chief of the place, Dr. Livingstone returned to the ship, and a few days afterwards set out with Dr. Kirk and Mr. Charles Livingstone, with a light four-oared gig, for Lake Nyassa. We have not space to follow this excursion on the western bank of the lake, from its southern to almost its northern extremity, from which the party returned to the ship on the 8th of November, just three months after their departure. We may just observe that the length of the lake, which lies in a direction almost due north and south, is above two hundred miles; its greatest width, from fifty to sixty miles, is near its northern extremity; and the least, at the broadest part of its southern extremity, twelve miles; the water was found to have a depth of from nine to fifteen fathoms about a mile from the shore, but in some places soundings were only to be had at a hundred fathoms, and the impression was that a ship could not find anchorage except near the shore. It is subject to sudden storms of great violence, lashing the waves with such fury as to raise a surf which astonished one of the seamen, who had been a fisherman on the coast of Ireland. The coast-line presents a succession of small bays. Never before in Africa had Dr. Livingstone seen so dense a population, especially about the southern part of the lake, which presented an unbroken chain of villages. Wherever they landed they were surrounded, especially at meal times, by huge crowds gazing upon them with wonder, and naming them "Chirombo," which, it seems, means such wild beasts only as are fit to be eaten. But the reason of this flattering distinction was not given. A vast quantity of native cotton cloth must be worked up for consumption; besides which there is a very large manufacture of cloth from the inner bark of an undescribed tree belonging to the *Cæsalpineæ*. The lake women are by nature very plain, and, by the universal adoption of the pelele, made hideous. There is a great love of the slave trade; for, on hearing that the English would have nothing to do with it, they often turned away with contempt, and refused to sell them any food.

They returned to the ship in a weak condition, having suffered more from want of provisions than during any previous trip. Shortly after they commenced their downward passage to the coast, they were delayed five weeks by a shoal a little below Chibisa's; and finally, after being once again shoaled in the Zambesi, they anchored in the great Cuabo mouth of the river. On the 30th of January, 1862, the *Gorgon* ship-of-war arrived, towing a brig bringing Mrs. Livingstone, some ladies about to join their relatives in the University Mission, and a new iron-steamer for the navigation of Lake Nyassa, which was brought out in twenty-four sections. The *Pioneer* steaming out towed the brig into Kongone; had as many of the sections

of the new steamer—christened the *Lady Nyassa*—transferred to her as she could carry; and after taking on board the ladies, the captain of the *Gorgon*, with a number of his officers and men to assist in landing the cargo, made way up the stream for the Ruo. Here was more delay, for the engines of the *Pioneer* having been neglected, they remained six months in the delta, of which Shupanga is the apex, instead of six days, as they expected. They resolved to land the sections at Shupanga, and when they were collected, to launch the hull of the *Lady Nyassa* at that place, from which she could be towed up to the foot of the Murchison cataracts. In this dilemma, Captain Wilson undertook to carry up Miss Mackenzie, Mrs. Burrup, together with his surgeon, Dr. Ramsay, in his gig, followed by Dr. Kirk and Mr. Sewell, paymaster of the *Gorgon*, in the *Lady Nyassa's* whaleboat. With great toil they reached the Ruo; and getting no tidings of the mission, they pushed on to Chibisa's, where they arrived, after having accomplished a voyage of nearer 300 than 200 miles. Here sad news awaited them. The bishop and Mr. Burrup were no more; the survivors in a critical position; and to their aid Captain Wilson and Dr. Kirk volunteered to go up the hills, leaving the ladies with Dr. Ramsay and the Makololo. Some of the mission were met with, but further search was put an end to by the illness of the two gentlemen, one of whom—Captain Wilson—must have sank but for his stout boatswain, who cheerfully carried along his commander, and managed to get him to the boat, which returned with the whole party to the *Pioneer*. The bishop, it appears, proceeding with Mr. Burrup towards the shore to reach Ruo, already suffering from diarrhœa, in consequence of previous exposure to wet and hunger, and of being again repeatedly wetted to the skin, was completely exhausted when, much after the appointed time, he reached Malo, an island at the mouth of the Ruo. He was here seized with fever; for three weeks did he struggle on against the disease, faithfully watched by the Makololo, but for whom the chief of Malo would have turned the dying man out of his hut. At length he died. In the deep dark forest they dug his grave; and Mr. Burrup himself, almost worn out with disease, repeated from memory some portions of the service for the burial of the dead over the body of his friend. Mr. Burrup was then taken up the stream some distance in a canoe, and afterwards placed on a litter of branches, and so carried back to his friends at Magomero, where he soon after died. Captain Wilson and his party on their return reached Shupanga on the 11th of March, whence they proceeded in the *Pioneer* to the Kongone, where all the mission party but one embarked on board the *Gorgon* for the Cape, on April the 4th. Between this and the 12th of June, the *Pioneer* was engaged in bringing up the remaining section of the *Lady Nyassa* to Shupanga, where she was launched on the 23rd. Meanwhile, a great calamity had occurred. About the middle of April, Mrs. Livingstone was prostrated by fever, and, in spite of all the medical aid rendered by Dr. Kirk, sank on the 27th of April, 1862. Surrounded by the little band of her countrymen, the good lady's coffin was lowered into a grave dug under the branches of the great baobab-tree.

"Those," said Dr. Livingstone, "who are not aware how this brave, good English wife made a delightful home at Kolobeng, a thousand miles inland from the Cape; and as the daughter of Moffat, and a Christian lady, exercised most beneficial influence over the rude tribes of the interior, may wonder that she should have braved the dangers of this down-trodden land. She knew them all; and, in the disinterested and dutiful attempt to renew her labours, was called to her rest instead. 'Fiat Domine voluntas tua!'" p. 417.

It seems to have been the fate of the expedition to lose a vast amount of valuable time, either from the incompetency of their vessels, or the varying floods of the rivers, at one time too high and swift, and at others too low, for their purpose. The Ma-Robert was scarcely to be regarded as a means of conveyance. We have seen the expedition delayed six months from both these causes. And now when the *Nyassa* was launched on the 23rd of June, and ready to sail, the waters of the Shire and the Zambesi had fallen so low that they were obliged to wait for the rains of December before there was any chance of taking her up to the cataracts of the Shire. To fill up the time, especially as draught oxen and provisions would be required from the Island of Johanna, it was determined, after touching there, to proceed to the Rovuma. In pursuance of this plan, the *Pioneer* left the river at Kongone on the 6th of August, and touching at Johanna was towed by H.M.S. *Orestes* to the mouth of the Rovuma in the beginning of September. The explorers proceeded up the river in two boats, very skilfully managed by the Zambesi men; and soon became satisfied that it could be only navigable for eight months in the year, but they pushed on to see if its upper part presented those capabilities of which they had heard so much from naval officers. The valley of the Rovuma is from two to four miles wide, confined by a range of highlands, and running W.S.W., but the channel of the river proceeds in zigzags, so that to make one mile in advance three miles of boating were required. Instead of the river being navigable for a month's sail, they found that a boat might push up for about six or eight days. They themselves came to a stop at the island of Nyamatolo, Long. E., 38° 36′, Lat. S., 11° 53′, about 156 miles from the mouth, where they found the river narrow, with a rapid only passable by native canoes. The banks of the river exhibit little of interest. They found some of the inhabitants extremely ill-disposed; at one place making an attack with a volley of musket-balls and poisoned arrows, but upon the fire being returned running off as fast as their legs could carry them. A peculiarity of the river is, that its cataracts, instead of being found in mountainous districts, as happens in other rivers, occur in the level country. On landing occasionally they found trees of a novel kind, and inhabitants who were living in temporary huts on the sand banks of the river,

chiefly occupied in hunting the Senze (Aulacodus Swindernianus), an animal the size of a large cat, but shaped like a pig, which they drive from its haunts by setting fire to the reeds. After a month's exploration, they returned to the *Pioneer* on the 9th of October, and sailed on the 18th for the Zambesi, touching at Johanna for the oxen, but forced, for want of fuel, to run into Quillimane, which they found only fit to be what it was, a depôt for the slave trade. They reached the Zambesi about the end of November, and with their usual luck were a month struggling up to Shupanga. On the 10th of January, 1863, the *Pioneer* was on its way up the Shire, with the *Lady Nyassa* in tow. And now they came in contact with frightful evidence of the horrors of the inland slave trade. The notorious half-caste Mariano, the "great Portuguese slave agent," had passed over the country, and left death and destruction in his track. In the following passage Dr. Livingstone gives us a picture of some of the horrors which met their eyes:—

"Dead bodies floated past us daily, and in the mornings the paddles had to be cleared of corpses, caught by the floats during the night. For scores of miles the entire population of the valley was swept away by this savage Mariano, who is again, as he was before, the great Portuguese slave agent. It made the heart ache to see the wide-spread desolation; the river banks, once so populous, all silent; the villages burned down, and an oppressive stillness reigning where formerly crowds of eager sellers appeared with the various products of their industry. Here and there might be seen on the bank a small, dreary, deserted shed, where had sat, day after day, a starving fisherman, until the rising waters drove the fish from their haunts, and left him to die. Tingane had been defeated; his people had been killed, kidnapped, and forced to flee from their villages. There were a few wretched survivors in a village above the Ruo, but the majority of the population was dead. The sight and smell of dead bodies was everywhere. Many skeletons lay beside the path, where in their weakness they had fallen and expired. Ghastly living forms of boys and girls, with dull, dead eyes, were crouching beside some of the huts. A few more miserable days of their terrible hunger, and they would be with the dead."—p. 450.

In the midst of these horrors they visited the grave of Bishop Mackenzie, who, probably, had he lived, would have fallen in some ineffectual attempt to strike down the arm of this remorseless ruffian. We are inclined, however, to think that Dr. Livingstone has made Mariano responsible for too large a proportion of these horrors. There had been a "drought of unusual severity," which had extended from Kebrabasa north-east to the Manganja highlands. The Tette slaves had fled to the woods to live on whatever they could pick up, where they were expected to perish; and we are informed that in a famine *like this*, which raged in 1854, *thousands* died of starvation. But the foray had aggravated the scourge of the famine, and Dr. Livingstone became more anxious than ever to transport his little vessel to the waters of Lake Nyassa, where he hoped by its presence to check the slave-trade. With his usual indefatigable energy he had the *Lady Nyassa* unscrewed, with the intention of taking her piecemeal over some forty miles of road, which was to be made, and thus pass the cataracts. But finding that the country people who had at first crowded around them, offering provisions for sale, and glad of the opportunity of being useful, now kept out of sight, so that they had to depend for fresh provisions on their guns, and to have the supplies for their native crew brought up 150 miles from the Zambesi, he was obliged to give up the project. He ascribes this desertion to the intrigues of the Portuguese, and in his indignation asserts, that "it is a monstrous mistake to believe in the honour of the Government of Portugal," and declares that the policy pursued by the Portuguese statesmen towards Africa is "simply infamous." These are grave charges, but assuredly if they can be substantiated on the evidence which Dr. Livingstone furnishes, it seems to be the duty of every state in Europe to give to Portugal some expression of its indignation. We some time since suspended diplomatic relations with a King of Naples for offences trivial in comparison with the horrors which the Portuguese nation permits or encourages in Africa.

Foiled in their purpose, suffering from the want of fresh provisions, and dispirited at the unnecessary failure of their efforts, dysentery ran through the expedition, and Dr. Kirk and Mr. Charles Livingstone, broken down by fever and fatigue, found it necessary to return to England. Dr. Livingstone was himself for a month dangerously ill, but as resolved as ever, and as soon as he had recovered he determined to proceed with Mr. Rae by land, with a view of ascertaining if a boat which they had left above the cataracts was safe and in a condition to convey them into the vicinity of the tribes near Lake Nyassa, where they could stock themselves with provisions, and thus be relieved of depending for precarious supplies on the wasted south. They found the boat suspended in the trees as they had left it, but so injured by fire, probably from the burning of the grasses, which had set fire to the woods, that they were obliged to return without it. The Murchison cataracts begin in lat. 15° 20′ and end in 15° 55′, in which space the river runs about forty miles, its direction being nearly north and south. There are five principal cataracts, and two or three smaller ones. The former fall a hundred feet in a hundred yards, at an agle of about 45°; one of them at an angle of 70°. From the upper to the lower lower Shire the descent is 1,200 feet. The river here, only from fifty to eighty yards wide, rushes like a "mill-race, and gives the impression of water power, sufficient to drive all the mills in Manchester, running to waste." The river is so full of mica that, even at low water myriads of particles may be seen floating and glittering in the sun. In passing by one of the cataracts called Pamozima, "the departed spirits or gods," they were offended by a smell like that of a dissecting room, and on examining, found it came from dead bodies in mats suspended from branches of trees: a mode of sepulture which Dr. Livingstone saw subsequently practised by the Parsees, in their "tow-

ers of silence," at Poonah near Bombay. It is the popular belief, we are told, that disembodied souls are perpetually hovering over this spot.

Reaching the ship on the 2nd of July, they found a despatch from Earl Russell, with instructions for the withdrawal of the expedition; but as the *Pioneer* could not descend the river before the December floods, Dr. Livingstone determined to carry a boat past the cataracts a second time, and sail along the eastern shore of the lake, with a view of determining if Colonel Rigby's information was correct, namely, that Lake Nyassa and the valley of the Shire supply the 19,000 slaves that annually pass through the custom-house of Zanzibar. The attempt to pass the boat was unsuccessful, and then Dr. Livingstone, taking with him the steward of the *Pioneer*, proceeded with the Makololo to acquire the information he desired. We shall not follow Dr. Livingstone in this unsuccessful attempt, merely observing that having made his way in a northerly direction to Kota-Kota, he then struck off in a westerly direction, and proceeded on the great slave track as far as Chinangas, in about longitude 33° E. and latitude 13° 30′ S. Here the men of the expedition began to suffer so much in health, provisions were so short, time passing away, and the orders for the withdrawal of the expedition so peremptory, that he reluctantly gave up his intention of walking round the lake, and returned to the ship, which he reached on the 31st of October, having travelled 660 geographical miles in fifty-five days. This would represent an average of twelve miles a day, or if the windings be taken into account, of fifteen miles.

Though the instructions from the Foreign Office, which, to the annoyance of Dr. Livingstone, had come open from England, and so been forwarded him from the Cape, announced that the seamen's wages would cease to be paid after the 31st of December, it was not until the 19th of January that the *Pioneer* could start on its way down. After being delayed, as usual, by an accident on the way, the vessel reached the coast, and was fortunate enough to meet with the *Orestes* and *Ariel*, which were cruising at the mouth of the river. The *Lady Nyassa*, which had been previously sent down the river, was taken in tow by the *Ariel*, and the *Pioneer* by the *Orestes*, for Mozambique. They encountered a heavy gale, and the little *Nyassa*, which escaped serious mischief through the admirable management of the *Ariel*, was, together with her comrade, safely brought to anchor in the harbor of Mozambique. On the 16th of April the *Lady Nyassa* steamed for Zanzibar, where, shipping fourteen tons of coal, they set sail for Bombay on the 30th, taking the chance of arriving there before "the break" of the monsoon. It is characteristic of that energy and adaptability which makes Dr. Livingstone so efficient an explorer, that he was the skipper of his own frail bark in this rather perilous adventure, his first schooling in this way being on board the *Asthmatic*, the person in charge of her having proved inefficient. In this sea-trip, moreover, he had principally to depend upon native Zambesians; his crew consisting of seven of these, two boys, three Englishmen, one stoker, one sailor, and one carpenter. The Zambesians proved capital sailors, and so eager for their work that not one of them gave up for sea-sickness. On reaching Bombay in the beginning of June, after having sailed 2500 miles, the little vessel glided into the harbour, such a dot, that no one noticed her arrival.

In summing up the result of his six years' labour Dr. Livingstone enumerates among the chief of them the discovery of a port, capable of being turned to commercial use; a correct appreciation of the Zambesi as a means of transit; proofs of the fertility of the soil and of its fitness for the growth of cotton, of which specimens of superior quality were collected from various districts, as well as of tobacco and the sugar cane. In a geographical point of view, the discoveries of Lakes Shirwa and Nyassa, the exploration of the Zambesi and the Shire, the examination of the Kebrabasa rapids, the Murchison, and, above all, the Victoria falls, are matters of great interest. But Dr. Livingstone is acutely sensible that the hoped-for moral results he trusted would reward his labours have not been realized. Wherever he went into districts hitherto visited, he found the slaver at work, and when penetrating into those unvisited, he found the slaver at his heels. It is obvious, too, that the slave-purchaser is not more eager to buy than the natives in general are willing to sell. He found abundant evidence too, of a state of incessant warfare, and read its tale in ruined villages and depopulated districts teeming with the evidence of a careful cultivation. But he found nowhere such a state of society as enabled him to work out either the industrial or moral ends for which the expedition was devised. We confess that, after perusing his work, we carry away but a very indistinct impression on one or two points. We could have wished, for instance, to have had a clearer appeciation of the intellectual capacity of the natives. Of their proficiency in certain mechanical arts and agriculture, there is abundant evidence. Speaking of the latter, Bishop Mackenzie said that one of his objects was to give them instruction in it, "but that he now saw that they knew far more about it than he did." Yet it seems curious that, though they cultivate esculents and other plants with skill, they have no idea—the Batoka are the single exception—of planting, rearing, or preserving fruit trees. In the same way, though they make excellent small axes, they cannot cut down large trees, for the want of large ones. Several instances are given of the ingenuity with which, on a small scale, they attempt irrigation. But no attempt has been made to cope with what is declared to be the great drawback in every part of Central Africa, that is, the scourge of the periodical droughts, which may be expected once in every ten or fifteen years, between the 10th and 15th degrees of S. lat., or once in every five years between the 15th and 20th degrees.*

* The seasons are thus described by Dr. Kirk :—

What they know is less a matter of surprise than that, knowing what they do, they should be without the capacity of spontaneously developing that knowledge. We much regret that no specimens have been given us of the exact matter of the conferences which on various occasions took place between the members of the expedition and the chiefs. When the intelligence of the black is questioned, Dr. Livingstone's retort is that he received answers as, or even more, pertinent than would have been given by the uninstructed classes of Europe. This is not very high praise, at the best, and is rather vague. A few conversations, as we have observed, set down, might have thrown some light on the subject. A short specimen or two has been given, of which the following is one:—Sleeping one night near a hut, a woman inside began to grind her corn at two o'clock in the morning, on which her daughter very sensibly asks, "Ma, why do you grind in the dark?" to which ma replied, "To buy cloth from the strangers, which will make you *look a little lady*." We must confess this has a very European sound. We should be very curious to know the literal meaning of the words in the native tongue, which are the equivalents of "look a little lady." One difficulty of translating the Bible into the language of these tribes, has, as we might expect, arisen from the want of abstract terms in it; and yet to our surprise, we find there is a word in it expressing "holiness," which is about the last word we should have imagined would have been found there.

Vanity, as we might suppose from what we see of the race in a state of slavery, is a predominant feature. Thus we are told, though "natural-born traders," they will present their wares to one merchant after another, and after a good deal of chaffering with each they will end by selling it to some one of them for even less than the first offered them: gain, it appears, being less gratifying to them than the self-importance of bargaining with their customers. Dr. Livingstone is of opinion that they believe in a Supreme Being, and have a vague notion of a continued existence. As respects their moral code, it coincides with the Christian, with the exception of polygamy, which institution the "ladies" set a high value upon. For when told of the monogamy of England, they exclaimed, as the Mormon ladies are in the habit of doing, "that they would not like to live in such a country." The ladies of the Makololo are much praised by the Doctor; they have "soft, small, delicate hands and feet; foreheads well developed; the nose not disagreeably flat, though the '*alae*'"—we fear we must translate this "*nostrils*"—"are full; the mouth, teeth, eyes, and general form are beautiful, and, contrasted with the west-coast negro, quite lady-like." These ladies having "maid-servants" to wait upon them, have nothing to do but to sip beer and smoke bang, which last accomplishment produces a minute eruption on the skin, and must much damage the charms assigned to them. But the condition of the African ladies is not everywhere so prosperous, for in the Manganja highlands it was quite painful, we are told, to see the women kneeling down as the travellers passed. Having made a present to the chief, Mongazi, he handed it to his wife, who respectfully received it upon her knees. In the next village, it is true, matters in this respect were somewhat mended; but there the chief was a lady. In some places the women appear in camp as traders, in others they respectfully wait on their knees until the men have effected their barter; while among the Jaggas of the north they are the sole traders, hold the markets, and suffer no man to come into the market-place. But the Makololo women are evidently the favourites; they are not black, but of a light, warm brown complexion, wear a kilt and mantle, and seem much given to ornaments, if we may judge by the head lady of Sesheke, who "wore eighteen solid brass rings as thick as one's finger on each leg, and three copper under each knee; nineteen brass rings on her left arm, and eight of brass and copper on her right, also a large ivory ring above each elbow;" when we add to this a bead necklace, and a bead sash around her waist, the toilet is complete. It is natural to suppose that this would not be a good walking attire, and it had, in fact, the inconvenience of impeding her legs and chafing her ankles. Civilization itself scarcely makes a greater sacrifice to fashion than this.

The "ladies" of the Makololo, though fond of rings, have rather an aversion to water, for which they substitute melted butter. This, we are told, keeps off parasites, but imparts a rancid smell to the clothes. The word "clothes" must be here used by synecdoche, or that figure of speech by which a part is taken for the whole. The dress of the men is simple: a monkey-jacket and skin around the hips, but neither trowsers, waistcoat, nor shirt. They, at all events, can have no trouble in walking, nor can all the ladies be hampered with rings; for while at the village of Pitsane the wife of the chief was busily engaged in building a hut; an occupation, it appears, which was left entirely to women and servants. These houses are round "towers" about eleven feet high, made of stakes and reeds plastered over, and with no other light or ventilation than such as can be admitted through a door only nineteen inches high, twelve inches wide at top, and twenty-two inches at bottom. It is difficult to understand how anything else can be admitted. The explanation of the "lady" was, that it was made so to keep out the mice. The roofs of these huts are thatched, and made to project over the sides for above three feet, and are met nearly at their edges by a plastered reed fence, making a circular room about the inner hut. The floor is made of soft tufa, or ant-hill material, and cow-dung. This plaster secures the inmates against the bites of poisonous insects, called *tampans*, which infest the soil. The travellers very naturally preferred sleeping in the outer enclosure to penetrating through the

"A cold one during May, June, and July; a hot during August, September, and October; and a rainy through the remaining part of the year. The rain, however, is not continuous, there sometimes being only passing showers, and even intervals of a week or more without any rainfall, in which the crops suffer from the sun. The thermometer occasionally reaches 103° in the shade."

mouse-hole into the inner prison. The art of upholstery is evidently not among their other arts. They must herd together like swine. We must take for granted, having no other information on the subject, that this is the general type of construction in the country. We miss details respecting the distribution of the villages and their population. In his excursion with Mr. Rae on the banks of Lake Nyassa, the Doctor finds the largest village he ever saw in Africa deserted by its inhabitants; but he unfortunately gives us no idea of its size. Mention, we see, is made of maid-servants and servants aiding the chief's wife in building. These servants are what are usually called slaves, which have been taken in forays attended with a "shocking waste of life"—made captive, as appears to us, for no proportionate advantage or any very conceivable purpose, if their condition be correctly described; for the captive is said to retain in his captivity the same rank which he had in his own tribe—a somewhat difficult matter when he happened to be a chief—while his children, and, indeed, all the captive children, have both the privileges and name of their masters, and when grown up are nearly equal to them, and may leave them and go where they like within the boundary of the "*kingdom*," though they are still in the condition of bondsmen. What use such a slave can be, and why they should take such frightful means to procure them, is not by any means clear; and so enviable is their condition that Dr. Livingstone's compassionate thoughts turn as he speaks of them to the poor of his own country, whose struggle for life contrasts so unfavourably with the facile subsistence which even the slave can here command. Nevertheless, he mentions two facts which by no means bear out the alleged respect for the slaves or the abundance of means at their command. When leaving Sesheke, a chief, Leshore, with a number of men, was sent as a guard of honour. These men belonged to the "black subject tribes," and when they entered any village, Leshore always cried out, "Look out for your property, and see that my thieves don't steal it;" and Dr. Livingstone remarks that these men required to be "looked at in the most charitable light." Then, again, as to the prevailing abundance. Only six days' march before arriving at Sesheke, they found the famine so great that the people were employed "in digging up *tsitla* roots out of the marshes, and cutting out the soft core of the young palm-trees for food;" and when commending the hospitality of Sekeletu, he notes that it was "a time of great scarcity and hunger." In fact, while at Sesheke, the headman from near Linyanti came to complain that all his people had run off, owing to the "hunger;" to which Sekeletu considerately replied, "You must not be left to *grow lean alone;* some of them must come back to you." These various statements are not in harmony with each other. Indeed, so great is the insecurity of life and property in these regions, that extensive highlands, once peopled by the Batoka, which but a *few years since* were rich in culture and produce, are now the grazing grounds of elephants; and where "multitudes existed not a man is to be found." This specification of *black tribes* would imply that these people were brought from a distance, for Dr. Livingstone remarks, that though the assertion may seem strange, yet it is none the less true, "that in all the tribes we have visited we never saw a really black person. Different shades of brown prevail, and often with a bright bronze tint, which no painter, except Mr. Angus, seems able to catch." There is no mention of tattooing as a general custom, but we hear of it occasionally, as among the Babisa, in the vicinity of Lake Nyassa, who are easily known by a line of horizontal cicatrices, each half an inch long, down the middle of the forehead and chin." A marked difference was noticed between the cranial configuration of the Babisa and the Manganja. The former—an energetic race, much addicted to trade and travelling—are distinguished by their round, bullet-shaped heads; differing in this respect from those of the latter, attached to agriculture and their homes.

The lovers of Natural History will find a good deal to interest them in this volume. One of the most curious novelties is that of an extraordinary bird, called the "Honey Guide." Whenever this bird catches sight of a man it endeavours to attract his attention by flying from tree to tree, looking back each time it alights to see if it be followed; its invariable object being, for some unknown reason, to lure him to a hive of bees and a store of honey. Another peculiar bird is the Buffalo Watcher. As they lie in the tall grass, these animals might be approached quite unperceived, were it not that this bird, which is seated on the animal, by flapping its wings and screaming gives the signal of alarm. A considerable difference is observed between African and Asiatic elephants. Of the latter, only the males have tusks, and this not invariably; while in the former they are found both in males and females. The African male elephant, moreover, is distinguished by the convex shape of his forehead and the enormous size of his ears, resembling those found upon Roman coins. Another very remarkable peculiarity is, that in the part of the jaw corresponding with the place in which the wisdom tooth appears in man, there is a succession of new teeth, each of which as it comes up pushes "the others along, and out at the front end of the jaws; thus keeping the molars sound by renewal, till the animal attains a very great age." Locality, it appears, very much affects the character of the tusks; those of animals from marshy districts being the largest, and those from dry districts the densest and heaviest. In the great marshes on the Shire, near the Ruo, there is one called the Elephant Marsh, in which a vast number of these animals are found: 800 were counted in one herd. But elephants must soon disappear from the country, as 30,000 are said to be annually killed for the sake of their tusks. But it is unnecessary to allude further to these matters, as we are promised an account of the Botany and Natural History of the country visited from the pen of Dr. Kirk. His collection of plants includes 4000 species. He possesses specimens of articles of food, native manufactures, many valuable woods, the va-

rieties of cotton in each spot visited, and a large number of birds and insects. Of the climate of this part of Africa not much good can be said, as respects the European; though the mortality in the expedition was not excessive, yet each of the persons composing it were at one time or struck down by dysentery or fever. Mr. Charles Livingstone and Dr. Kirk, as we have remarked, were obliged to return to England. Mr. Thornton, who left the expedition early to assist the Baron van der Decken in his journey up Kilimanjaro (which they ascended to the height of 8000 feet, and found covered with perpetual snow), fell a victim when he returned to it in his generous attempt to supply the remnant of Bishop Mackenzie's party with food, which brought on dysentery and fever on 21st of April, 1863. If we add to these losses, at no great distance of time from each other, the deaths of Mrs. Livingstone, Bishop Mackenzie, and Mr. Burrup, and the havoc made among the missionaries of the London Society, headed by Mr. Helmore, of whom six out of nine had died at Linyanti, when the expedition was within no great distance of them, we shall have a list of casualties which tells fearfully against the climate. In addition to these, the death of the Baron van der Decken has been recently announced. Nothing daunted, however, by the comparative failure of his recent essay to throw Africa open to civilizing influences, Dr. Livingstone is again devoting himself to the great object he has at heart. Under the sanction of Government, co-operating with the Geographical Society, and assisted by a munificent donation from a private friend of £1000, he proposes to ascend the Rovuma, or some other river north of Cape Delgado, and accomplish that task of substituting legitimate commerce for slave traffic on the east coast, which, as he declares, has been so successfully executed on the west. He will thus be beyond the confines of the so-called Portuguese territory, secure from the authorized obstructions and evil influences which thwarted him in his recent expedition. Another object will be to pass along the northern end of the Lake Nyassa and round the southern end of Lake Tanganyika, for the purpose of ascertaining the watershed of that part of Africa. What will be the result of this new enterprise we must wait with patience to know, but, at the same time, with the satisfactory conviction, that if consummate qualifications can ensure success, it will be beyond all doubt successful.

Contemporary Literature.

The Foreign Books noticed in the following sections are chiefly supplied by Messrs. Williams & Norgate, *Henrietta-street, Covent-garden, and* Mr. Nutt, 270, *Strand.*

Theology and Philosophy.

The principal literary event of the quarter in the interest of progressive theology in England is the issue of the translation of Strauss's "New Life of Jesus."[1] It is a perfectly readable and intelligible book; and our own public will now be able without difficulty to judge for themselves on which side lies the truth, or that which is nearest the truth—on the side of the "infidel Strauss," or on the side of those who prefer so to denounce him, instead of grappling with his statements. The original work has already received ample notice in the pages of this Review, but a few remarks upon occasion of the translation may be admissible. The considerations which induced Strauss to adapt his work for the general public in Germany equally recommend the translation for circulation in England. He has pointed out (Pref., p. xvi.) in reference to his own country, that the efforts there making in various quarters towards greater freedom in ecclesiastical forms can by no means reach the root of the religious questions which have to be settled in the present day. And in England no delusive relaxation of clerical subscription, no petty revision of the established Liturgy, no practical allowance of insignificant liberties in legal or voluntary churches, no latitudinarian talk, mystical subterfuges, or sentimental escapes, will suffice to postpone for very long the sifting of the essential problem, How did Christianity originate? Did it originate as an outcoming from the working of a natural order, or by a supernatural interference? If it were founded in miracle, it may be expected to bring with it mysterious dogmas, occult sacramental influences, or immediate operations of grace; and however various churches and schools may differ as to the particular modes wherein they suppose the supernatural in Christianity continues to manifest itself, they have this in common—that they assume Christianity to be a supernatural revelation, and to have had at least its birth in miracle. The tendency of discussion on these subjects has undoubtedly been to divide the religious world into two camps, and two camps only: Romanist and Protestant, Episcopalian and Congregationalist, Calvinist and Arminian, on the one side, and rational religionists on the other. The claim to be the depositaries of supernaturally communicated truth is as haughtily made by a Calvinistic Synod as by an Anglican or Roman hierarchy. "New Presbyter is but Old Priest writ large." "And he," says Strauss, "who would banish priests from the Church must first banish miracles from religion." The problem, therefore, which our distinguished author has put in the plainest manner before Christendom is, Whether Christianity had a miraculous origin or not. He has put it, not before the learned only, but before all persons of ordinary education, understanding, and seriousness. Nor can the English public, with his last work before them in their own language, in any fairness to themselves and to the profoundness of the interests involved, decline to judge for themselves of the

[1] "A New Life of Jesus." By David Friedrich Strauss. Authorized translation. In two volumes. London: Williams and Norgate. 1865.

validity of his arguments. Exceptions may be taken to details, to the force attributed by the author to particular arguments, to the sufficiency of certain hypotheses to account for particular phenomena which otherwise must go without solution. But these partial exceptions will not invalidate, as we apprehend, the main conclusions of the author, either on the negative or on the positive side; for, however it may surprise some to be so informed, there are undoubtedly positive conclusions arrived at by Strauss, or to be inferred from his labours, which are of the highest practical value. For it must be of the highest practical value to elucidate the real causes which produced Christianity as it has been, even though it shall be thereby shown to have been founded in great degree on misconceptions; for those errors and misconceptions are themselves facts in human history, though destined to be transient ones. It is said, indeed, not unfrequently, that a Christianity without miracle would not be a Christianity worth having. But if that should prove after all to be the Christianity which it has pleased God to give us, it behoves us to be content with it, though we should have delighted in something more marvellous; and should such non-miraculous Christianity turn out to be true, we may be sure that it will best serve the interests of humanity, though not, it may be, the interests of priestcraft.

Strauss, meanwhile, has been more maligned as to the purpose and object of his works than any living author. It is systematically represented that his object has been to sweep away the Christian religion, to defame and obliterate, if possible, the person of its founder. No doubt he has said pungent things concerning certain theories and certain defenders of Christianity—*facit indignatio versum.* But it is an essential part of his present undertaking to set forth, in the first instance, the life of Jesus, as it may be conceived to have had a seat in actual history; for his personal existence being assumed as historical, the process by which a supernatural dress was thrown over a natural but singular life becomes the more intelligible. Such a creation as is presented by the Jesus of the Gospels would have been impossible if no Jesus had existed; nor however incongruous some portions of the dress may appear to us which has been thrown over that figure, was it other than the most honourable which could be imagined by those who invested him with it; and thus the real superiority and eminence of his person may fairly be inferred. Hence the negative criticism which, in the first place, demonstrates the impossibility of the Gospel histories, as narratives throughout of actual events, prepares the way for a hypothesis, which assumes the non-miraculous appearance of Jesus in history and then accounts for the supernatural attributes ascribed to him. So that, neither is he dishonoured nor are base motives imputed to those who gave its form to his history; much less is the essential and truly religious element in Christianity sought to be abolished, though its validity no longer rests on the supposition of its having been supernaturally communicated.

"Indispensable, but also imperishable, remains that part of Christianity, by which it raised human nature above the sensual religion of Greece on the one hand, and Jewish legalism on the other; on one side, that is, the belief that the world is governed by a spiritual and moral Power; on the other, the perception that the service of such a Being can only be like himself, namely, a moral and spiritual one, a worship of the disposition and the heart. We can indeed scarcely contemplate the latter element as constituting a continuing remnant among us of the old Christianity; since in a real and true sense it has never yet been generally established. . . . . So long as Christianity is considered as something given from without, its Author as literally heaven-descended, the church as a machinery for procuring the expiation of man's offences through his blood, Christianity, though claiming to be the religion of the spirit, must remain unspiritual and in fact Jewish. Only when it is seen that in Christianity man did become more deeply conscious of his own true nature, that Jesus was the individual in whom this deeper consciousness first became a supreme all-pervading influence, that redemption means but the advent of such a disposition and its inward adoption as our very life-blood, then only is Christianity really and thoroughly understood."—p. xiv.

Perhaps the portion of the work which we should especially commend to the attention of English readers is the whole of the introductory matter on the "Gospel Sources of the Life of Jesus," especially that part of the discussion which treats of the fourth Gospel, and of the critical enquiry which Baur has directed upon it. The hypothesis of myth, strictly so-called, accounts for the unhistorical parts of the first three Gospels, and in having traced out elaborately how these unhistorical portions were probably generated spontaneously out of current Jewish conceptions and imaginations concerning the Messiah and his kingdom, consists Strauss's great distinction. But the theory of myth—that is, of an unconscious and spontaneous invention—is only very partially applicable to the fourth Gospel; and the great service which Baur rendered to the advancement of New Testament criticism lay in the application to the fourth Gospel of the hypothesis of conscious fiction in furtherance of a tendency or design. In substance, Strauss admits thoroughly both the services rendered by Baur and the obligations he has been under to his suggestions, together with the distinction between the principles of myth and of tendency; but he is so enamoured of the term "myth" that he insists on extending its application so as to embrace both kinds of invention—the conscious as well as the unconscious, the intentional as well as the unintentional fiction. This is truly little more than a debate about words; for whatever terms are employed to describe the facts, it is evident that unconscious fiction is most prevalent in the first Gospel, less so in the third, and least of all, in the fourth; while conversely, conscious fiction and tendency writing has the greatest place in the fourth, less in the third, and least in the first. While, however, the first Gospel is, in the special sense of the word, the most mythical of all, it is also the most historical; but in the fourth all which, as history, goes beyond the earlier Gospels, is "pure invention or mod-

ification." Nevertheless, although the tone of thought attributed to Jesus in the fourth Gospel appears, historically speaking, to have been foreign to him, there are cases in which "a philosopher of a later age has attained to the correct understanding of a poem or a religion by the interposition of ideas, of which the poet or the founder of the religion himself knew nothing." (p. 187.) Moreover, it seems that the first disciples of Jesus did not in all things understand him, and that their stand-point remained behind his, so that the fourth Evangelist "may have mounted to his more elevated position by means of a ladder borrowed from Alexandria, and so by means of this foreign ladder have come nearer to Jesus's own standpoint." (p. 188.) The defenders of old opinions would do well to appreciate fairly the more conservative portions in the theories both of Strauss and the Tübingen school, and not themselves to throw away that of which no one seeks to rob them.

Singularly appropriate to the publication in English of the foregoing is the appearance at the same time of a very remarkable work by Mr. W. W. Lloyd,[2] intended to illustrate the origin of Christianity by selecting for discussion those incidents from the Evangelical and Apostolical history which the great painter chose as the most suggestive scenes he could depict. The work, we are informed, has been in print some time, previously, indeed, to the publication in German of Strauss's last "Life," and among the few friends to whom it was submitted it received the cordial approbation of the great critic himself. The author describes the historical part of his work as having been undertaken "in earnest search for a reply to the inquiry—When we have utterly and heartily given up whatever in the New Testament is fairly convicted as unhistorical, what facts remain for us unimpeached after all the questioning? and what is the series, the significance, the connection of these cardinal facts in the story of human civilization, which have thus come thrice tried through the fire?" He gives it as his opinion that the Tübingen critics have written too much as if they had still to make out a case in order to put the history and its documents on their defence. Whatever be the case abroad, this is, however, still necessary in England; and Mr. Lloyd must not be surprised if in some quarters his own labours should be stigmatized as destructive, however conscious he may be of a desire to elicit and preserve such true history as may be gathered by inference from the Christian traditions. For in giving up the miracles of the New Testament, the New Testament itself is not given up; it is a fact in history, and a reasonable account must be given of its origin, including the origin of the miraculous narratives themselves. Mr. Lloyd's theory concerning their genesis is sufficiently distinguishable, at least in the extent to which he applies it, both from the Straussian, or properly mythical, and from the Tübingen, or tendency theory, to receive a name of its own; it may be called the emblematic theory, and he should be allowed to do justice to it in his own words:—

"Old Testament literature, and the associations of ancient prophets and of Messianic anticipations founded on prophecy, however irregularly—these were the fund of lore from which the imagery of the gospel stories was for the most part drawn; they were combined with some truly historical personal incidents, and they had to suffer the usual casualties of copy and re-copy in additions and glosses, false divisions, and mistaken agglutinations. But still, all these influences and operations combined do not constitute, and do not conduct us to, the germinant principle which governed the form of assimilation."—p. 258.

It is undoubtedly quite a different thing to identify accurately the bits of a mosaic from appreciating the design which combined them in a composition. What then was the organizing motive which presided over the composition of the miraculous stories related in the New Testament?

"The answer to this question that approves itself to me—approves itself on re-consideration after twenty years—is, that most of the miraculous incidents in the life of Jesus originated with a section of the early Christians that had little or no direct knowledge, or even information, of the details of his personal career; that they were composed originally with perfect consciousness of a definite, and that for the most part a moral or controversial aim. Inasmuch as the authors, most probably Hellenistic Jews, were imbued with Jewish associations, their productions naturally relished of the antecedents and the anticipations of the nation. Strong controversial feelings will ever give an undesigned colour to the most simple-minded narrative; but we deal here with something more, and something much more pronounced. The composers, the poets, the prophets, or prophesiers, as they might call themselves, appear to me to have aimed, in many cases, at illustrating the proper Christian view of a pending controversy, by inventing such an incident for the life of Christ as would apply with cogency as a precedent—tell with the authority of a decision. In other cases we can trace no motive, other than what we may consider purely poetical."—p. 259.

And the emblematical or typical principle presided not only over the composition of the miraculous stories, but over other parts of the histories:—

"Precepts and parables, therefore, are put into the mouth of Jesus which bear directly upon discussions that, by their very nature, could only have arisen subsequently to his death and to the changes in the anticipations of his followers that then ensued; or, in other cases the weight of his authority is borrowed by the ascription of proceedings to him, that have either a direct or symbolical bearing on current difficulties."—p. 260.

And the author instances that the determination of the questions which arose at Antioch (Acts xv.) appears to be transformed into incidents in the Gospel history (Matt. xv., Mark vii., Luke xi.,) where Jesus is represented as denouncing the extreme and hypocritical ritualism of the Pharisees: "the great denunciation

[2] "Christianity in the Cartoons referred to Artistic Treatment and Historic Fact." By William Watkiss Lloyd. London: Williams and Norgate. 1865.

of the Pharisees in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew is full of innuendos that go straight to the blot of the difficulties at Antioch." And it would not be easy to parry the force of the observation that "had the contents of these chapters been on record at the time among reverenced archives of the Christian community, they could scarcely have escaped reference and citation" in the discussion at Antioch, supposing, that is, the narrative in the Acts to be historical. Many of the parables may thus be supposed to have originated. They remain as pregnant of meaning and as significant, as they are according to the traditional view, and illustrate, as in the case of the Prodigal Son, the Husbandmen and the Vineyard, the Marriage Feast, the admission of the Gentiles to Gospel privileges. There is only this difference: according to the supernatural view these parables are prophetical anticipations; according to the natural one, embodiments of foregone conclusions. The same account may be given of incidents in the life of Jesus:—

"The anecdotes that are related as incidents in his life, have constantly in this sense not the slightest historical foundation; a very important historical significance, however, as the embodiments of the vicissitudes of the Church, its leaders and its doctrines at a later date; in types of which the stuff is borrowed, ready-made, from the prophecies and marvellous narratives of the Old Testament."—p. 276.

This is exemplified in the account of the Transfiguration, which thus has very much of the same significance which is given to it by orthodox commentators; but in the one case the significance belongs to it as a miraculous event, in the other as a suggestive presentation. Hence, when a great artist like Raphael depicts such a scene from the Gospel history as that of the Transfiguration, he is not pretending to show us how the event happened, but to shadow forth to us, through the picture, the idea which is suggested and is embodied in the history. This ideal character, however, by no means belongs equally to all the cartoons, and we are not competent here to trace out differences between the more pragmatical and the more ideal of these designs, which would have admitted of further explanation from the accomplished author. We welcome exceedingly this criticism of the early Christian history, of native English growth, but in courage, learning, and acuteness, worthy of any country. If to a very large extent Mr. Lloyd is found to coincide with Strauss, it is not because he has copied or imitated him, but after long study has independently arrived at the same conclusions. We must permit ourselves, however, to give an instance in which the two critics differ, and wherein the German appears more conservative or cruder than the Englishman. The words said to have been uttered on the cross, "*Eli, Eli, lama sabacthani*," were they really uttered? and if so, what did they indicate? Mr. Lloyd says—

"I find it difficult to believe that the depression which comes before us so affectingly in the scenes of the supper and the garden agony, that declares itself in that seeming dulness or blindness before accusers, and in the very indifference to favourable interference from Pilate, is not a true general representation of the bowed spirit that finds its faith effectless, and plunges back into its recollections, to seek in vain, not the source of its error, but the explanation of its disappointment. The feeling of confidence in a promise accepted as divine makes head to the last, but at the last gives up with that bitterest cry of undescribed despair that ever was uttered, 'My God! My God! why hast Thou forsaken me?'"—p. 75.

On the other hand, Strauss points out the discrepancies between the several Evangelists as to the last words, and says, "Of the third it is probable, and of the fourth beyond doubt, that they would have rejected, with a protest, the expression which the two first put into the mouth of Christ the crucified."—(ii. 376.) If the two first Evangelists indeed really supposed the words to have been used, they would be to them little more than a citation; but he adds—

"If we look to Jesus and the tone of feeling of which these words, if he spoke them, must have been the expression, it will require not merely in the case of the Man-God of ecclesiastical doctrine most arbitrary assumption to make a feeling of abandonment by God conceivable in him, but even we upon our purely human point of view, should be afraid of derogating from the spiritual and moral elevation of Jesus, if even at this crisis of most profound suffering we were to attribute such a feeling to him; for by it would be implied the supposition that he had made and now discovered a mistake in himself and his work and his own conception of both, as he must otherwise have recognised in the very death which had now overtaken him personally, the true and real way to the triumph of his cause which he had long foreseen."—ii. p. 377.

The orthodox view that a Divine person uttered such a complaint of Divine abandonment is inconsistent with itself, unless, in order to save consistency, the cry be supposed illusive, which is profane, nor is there any pathos in a complaint of abandonment which was felt not to be real: In the supposition made by Mr. Lloyd there is consistency and pathos most profound, but it is a supposition deeply wounding to the Christian sentiment. The "infidel Strauss" here comes to the rescue with a hypothesis presenting no insuperable difficulties, literary, psychological, or moral, and which, if it spares our tears, spares also the honour of the Founder of the Christian religion.

The Bishop of Natal is certainly a most indefatigable person, and his innate power of work has been stimulated by enlarged views which his own inquiries have opened up to him, and by the provocations of a controversy which he has had to sustain single handed against all comers.[3] At the outset of his work on the Pentateuch, though he saw much further than

[3] "The Worship of Baalim in Israel: based upon the work of Dr R. Dozy, 'The Israelites at Mecca'" By Dr. H. Oort, Pastor of Santpoort. Translated from the Dutch, and enlarged with notes and appendices. By the Right Rev. John William Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. London: Longmans. 1865.

those who sought to put him down by a sneer at "arithmetical questions," he by no means understood the range which must be taken if he followed out his investigations with thoroughness—he by no means anticipated the polemical necessity for that thoroughness which he has since perceived to be requisite—he was not, at that time, adequately informed as to what had been done upon his own subject by others abroad, if not in England—he had not measured the greatness of the undertaking in which he had engaged; but, above all, he had no conception of the deep seat in the English mind of Biblical prejudices. Misled by the simplicity of his own heart, he had not the least anticipation of the forces, ecclesiastical, civil and social, which would be arrayed against him, nor of the efforts which in consequence would be required from himself. But his bark rose to the waves. Up to the very last moment of his stay in England, he was occupied in fortifying his polemical position, and he left behind him for publication a translation of the work we here note, enriched with his own observations; in which together many things will be found to illustrate and confirm the conclusions he had already arrived at. For if the non-Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and more especially the late date of the Book of Deuteronomy, be assumed, and if the Levitical Law be supposed to have been a scheme or ritual devised by the priesthood in the time of the earlier kings, but never actually carried into effect, the question must be answered, Would the phenomena actually presented in the history coincide with these suppositions, at least better than with the supposition of the Israelites having brought with them into Canaan a distinct national worship, and an elaborately organised sacerdotalism? The account usually given of the worship of the high places, and of that especially in Bethel and in Dan, is, thas it was a corruption of the true worship, a superstitious and idolatrous imitation of the worship at Jerusalem. Aaron's calf is by many connected with it, which is supposed to have been brought out of Egypt, and to have been imitated from the worship of Apis. But it is quite inconceivable that the oppressed Israelites should have taken their worship from the Egyptians, or that the "gods which brought them out of Egypt" should have been fashioned after an Egyptian model. Apis, moreover, was a living steer: the "calves" in Bethel and in Dan were heifers—*ἀι δαμάλεις αἱ χρυσαῖ*. The absence of all trace in the history of any worship conducted according to the Levitical ritual, or of any observance even of the Passover till the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah, together with the hold which the worship of the high places had upon the people, lead to think that it was native, and anterior to the Jehovistic worship which the prophets and reformers desired to introduce. Dr. Dozy and Bishop Colenso concur in considering that it was an original rude form, out of which the more refined religion was developed, thus to have been a Baal worship, and that the Israelites learnt the name Jehovah from the Syro-Phœnicians. The Bishop considers that in the days of the Exodus there was no national God of Israel; that what worship the Israelites had was loose and undefined as that of a straggling horde might be, and that they then fell readily into the worship of the Phœnician Baal, IHVH or IAO. And he quotes Von der Alm, who says—

"The whole 300 years of the period of the Judges must be regarded as a time during which the Hebrews and Canaanites, under various leavening influences, were blended into one people. In this process the Israelites, it is true, had the upper hand as regards external power; but as happens to all conquerors, they submitted themselves to the old inhabitants of the land in respect of religion, morals, and customs. When they came forward as one people under David and Solomon, their whole worship was Phœnician. Phœnicians built the temple at Jerusalem, and the national Deity became the mysterious Phœnician IAO or IHVH."—p. 17.

It is of course essential to observe the distinction between the worship of the Syrian Baal and that of the Tyrian Baal, introduced by Ahab into Samaria and by Athaliah into Jerusalem; for although they were both undoubtedly founded upon a sun-worship, that of the Tyrian Baal was regarded as abominable and idolatrous by those who still continued the worship of the high places. Common, however, to both these forms of worship, and symbolical of the generative principle, was the setting up of the "ashērah." The word is translated "grove" in our English version, but there can be no doubt what sort of emblem it was. These forms were set up in Judah under Rehoboam (1 Kings xiv. 23); Ahab made, not "a grove," but "the ashērah," probably a remarkable one, which was not destroyed by Jehu, but "remained in Samaria" (2 Kings xiii. 6); in both kingdoms they were set up "on every high hill and under every green tree" (1 Kings xiv. 23)—an expression altogether inconsistent with the supposition of the "ashērah" being "a grove;" so is Manasseh's making a "grove," and probably a model or smaller one "in the house of the Lord," and the "women weaving hangings for it" (2 Kings xxi. 3, 7; xxiii. 6, 7). Therefore it is most hasty when Dr. Stanley says, in the volume we are about to notice, "Such a grove, as we have seen, was allowed to stand even within the temple precincts;" which is difficult to imagine for a grove of trees. "There was a charm in the shade of the oak, the poplar, and the terebinth, peculiarly attractive to the Israelite and Phœnician devotion." And he adds an unfortunate note upon the word "shade": "This is the force of the word translated 'grove;'" referring at the same time to the passages which speak of the groves being "*under* every green tree;" which, though impossible for a grove, would be suitable enough for a phallic emblem. So far from the word having in it the notion of shade, it is derived from אָשַׁר "to be upright."[*]

[*] More to the apparent purpose would have been to have cited from the English Bible in confirmation of the usual rendering, "Thou shalt not plant thee a grove of any trees near unto the altar of the Lord thy God" Deut. xvi. 21); which is, however, only, "thou shalt not fix an ashērah of any wood"—עֵץ

It will probably be objected, that even if the whole Levitical system be not the work of Moses, and even if Deuteronomy belong to the age of Josiah, the existence of the Decalogue is inconsistent with a religion and worship so rude as that of the Israelites is supposed by the Bishop of Natal to have been; and one of his most startling positions, but one worthy of the most serious examination, is that the Decalogue itself, as given in Exodus xx., is not Mosaic. The reasons, or some of them, for arriving at this conclusion are given in the Appendix. We trust that the Bishop will continue to pursue his researches, and that from time to time we shall have the benefit of them in England.

The second series of the Dean of Westminster's "Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church,"[a] professes to delineate its essential features during the whole duration of the monarchy. The author undoubtedly finds himself here on firmer ground than in his preceding period, and is enabled to assume more of the style of the historian—it is not so difficult as in the earlier section of his work to distinguish between the historical and poetical portions of the narrative; though there are many passages in which the historical facts and the Oriental figures are too closely interwoven to be easily separated. We must observe at once that there are fictions and legends interlaced even in this portion of Jewish history, which it is a mere euphemism to dignify by the name of poetry, or to designate simply as Oriental figure. And it is the special vice of an author whose excellences are in many respects inimitable, frequently to leave unattempted a discrimination when it might have been possible, or at least ought to have been attempted, between the historical and the fictitious in the "sacred writings." At least it might have been expected that, leaving room for difference of opinion, he should have stated alternatives with clearness, instead of confounding them in a haze of sentiment or of taste. To many readers, no doubt, the perusal of these lectures will have the effect of letting in the light; but the learned Dean is evidently afraid of letting in too much. He is like one who opens the shutters of a dark chamber, but immediately draws down a painted blind, artistically painted, no doubt, but still effectual to prevent a view of the realities without. The great question which arises on the perusal of the Jewish history is, Have we before us a part of "that wave that echoes round the world?" Does this story also fall into that "continuity recognised by the philosophy of history, no less than by theology—by Hegel, no less than by Augustine"? (p. xi.) Or have we a reliable record of immediate divine interposition—of the taking of "a people from the midst of another people by signs and by wonders, and by a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm"? This question Dean Stanley may be reproached by some for having, to a certain extent, opened; by others, we think with more justice, with having effectually obscured. In the first place, he has over-estimated generally the value of the evidence to the truth of the history, if that history be considered to embrace necessarily the miracles related in it. The constant references of the books "of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, to records, which, though lost, were evidently contemporary, furnish a guarantee for the general truthfulness of the narrative, such as no other ancient history not itself contemporary can exhibit." (p. vii.) It is true we have references in Kings and Chronicles to various annals for the "acts" of the kings, "the cities that they built," "the wars that they warred," and such things as the "ivory house that Ahab made;" but no such evidence is appealed to for the story of the Witch of Endor, or for the miracles of Elijah and Elisha. It cannot be maintained that the history of the kings would fall to pieces, though it might be reduced to little more than annals, if the wonders said to have been wrought by those prophets were torn out of it. In fact, the history, as given in the Chronicles, is written without them; and though the Chronicles were compiled, as Dean Stanley justly points out, in the priestly or historical interest, it is inconceivable that such a narrative as that of the translation of Elijah would not have been at least alluded to had it been a well-established event in the national history. Besides this loose general reference to the evidence, when the particular stories come before him, our author takes no pains to analyse them, or to ascertain whether there be or be not any historical nucleus beneath them. For though he be evidently unwilling to commit himself distinctly to the belief of their literal truth, he escapes, when the reader flatters himself he must be approaching the question of fact or no fact, under cover of various fallacies—the fallacy of the landscape, the fallacy of sentiment, the fallacy of an ethical or religious improvement, the fallacy of historical analogy; and these come upon us sometimes with the suddenness of the Aristophanic "joke by surprise." It may be that the question of fact has become in these matters unimportant or secondary in the estimation of the author. So long as a narrative lends itself kindly to the drawing of some "lesson of wisdom," or a type or analogy can be found in it to scenes repeated in other histories, it may not much matter whether as history it be true or false. Not the least curious instance of the extent to which his habit of seizing on

---

is as properly used of fixing a post as of planting a tree, and עֵץ is "wood" whether living or dead. Equally misleading would be, "And also concerning Maacah, the mother of Asa the king, he removed her from being queen because she had made an idol (marg. Heb. *horror*) in a grove" (2 Chron. xv. 16; 1 Kings xv. 10). It is uncertain what the word rendered "idol" may mean, it comes from a root signifying "to tremble;" but it cannot signify *in* a grove, rather *at*, *on*, or perhaps *for*. Some think that the queen had added the *αἰδοῖα γυναικος* to the emblem, which might thus resemble the *lingam-yoni* of the Hindus. It is probable that the ordinary *ashērah* had a conventional form, which might not be obviously offensive, but there was some peculiarity about this *ashērah* which rendered it obscene.

[a] "Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part II. From Samuel to the Captivity." By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Dean of Westminster. London: John Murray. 1865.

remote and superficial analogies, recurring indeed in almost every page of the book, has entirely obliterated all true historical sense and judgment, occurs at the close of his account of the miraculous career of Elisha:—

"And when at last his end comes in a great old age, he is not rapt away like Elijah, but buried with a splendid funeral; a sumptuous tomb was shewn in after ages over his grave in the royal city of Samaria; and funeral dances were celebrated round his honoured resting-place. Alone, of all the graves of the saints of the Old Testament, there were wonders wrought at it, which seemed to continue after death the grace of his long and gentle life. It was believed that by the mere touch of his bones a dead corpse was reanimated. In this, as in so much beside, his life and miracles are not Jewish but Christian. His works stand alone in the Bible in their likeness to the acts of mediæval saints. There alone in the sacred history the gulf between Biblical and Ecclesiastical miracles almost disappears."—p. 327.

That accounts of mediæval miracles were some of them fashioned upon the accounts of the miracles of Elisha is probable enough. Dr. Stanley, however, seems to suppose the mythus also grew backwards. But as to the facts. Does Dr. Stanley mean his readers to infer the falsity of the miracles attributed to Elisha, because of their resemblance to those of "St. Benedict and St. Bernard"? We should think by no means; for he does not assert or intimate these latter to be incredible, and though "mediæval" they are "Christian." Does he then intend us to accept the reality of the miracles attributed to "mediæval saints" because of their likeness to those ascribed to Elisha? He by no means says so, nor does he venture to assert of the miracles ascribed to Elisha that they are credible. His readers must be content to be left in uncertainty, and will in like manner often find themselves abandoned in slippery places by an historian whose love is for the fabulous, and by a Protestant whose sympathy is with the superstitions of the mediæval church. We might remark, if space allowed, on the very inadequate investigation applied to the earlier forms of the Jehovah worship, although glimpses are given in the hewing Agag in pieces "before the Lord," in the hanging up of the sons of Saul "before the Lord," in the "fiery oven" made of the Ammonitish captives (p. 104), that the earlier worship was a "fierce ritual of Syria," not very dissimilar from that of "Moloch, horrid king;"—on the account given of the worship of the golden calves as derived from Egypt, and yet a corrupt worship of Jehovah, which is old-fashioned and unpainstaking: or on instances where not so much the judgment passed on base actions themselves, as omitted to be passed on the tone of the narrator, tends to confuse the moral sense. There seems a great defect in the treatment of the questions connected with Josiah's reformation and the finding the book of the Law; and whatever may be thought of the subject of miracles, the authorship and the date of the book of Deuteronomy is certainly now ripe for discussion. Dr. Stanley moves more freely in his treatment of the prophets. He starts frankly with asserting that the supernatural is at least higher than the preternatural, and he deals admirably with Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Great Unknown or second Isaiah: he illustrates ably their political influence in great crises of the State—their antagonism to the priestly party, their high moral tone, their appeals to the personal conscience, and the catholicity of their principles. He describes also, in a few closing pages, which are well worthy of the greatness of the views which they open, the commencement of a new period for the religious history of the world, when "the Semitic races were to make way for the Indo-Germanic or Aryan nations, which were henceforth to sway the fortunes of mankind." (p. 579.) Cyrus, who is sung by the "Great Unknown" as the Shepherd of Jehovah and inaugurator of a reign of righteousness, "spoke the tongue, not of Palestine or Assyria, but of the West." Dr. Temple has already familiarized the English public with the idea of a Christendom wherein Jewish, Greek, and Roman elements are combined. Mr. Merivale has directed attention to the preparation made by the conquests of Alexander the Great for the extension of a world-wide religion; but of still greater interest and import are the observations of the Dean of Westminster on the impulse given by Cyrus the Persian to the onward movement of the religion of humanity. Speaking of the second Isaiah, Dr. Stanley says—

"In the remoter horizon is the vision of a gradual amelioration of the whole human race, to be accomplished not, solely or chiefly by the seed of Israel, but by those outlying nations which were but just beginning to take their place in the world's history. In the strains of triumph which welcome the influx of these Gentile strangers, we recognise the prelude of the part which, in the coming fortunes of the Jewish (?) Church, is to be played, not only by Cyrus, and if so be, Zoroaster, but by Socrates and Plato, by Alexander and by Cæsar. It has been truly observed that the new elements which Christendom received from the Greek, the Roman, and the Teutonic world, were almost as important as those which it received from the Jewish race. To have recognised and anticipated this truth, is the rare privilege of this Evangelical Prophet."—p. 581.

Dr. Stanley of course does not draw the inference which will be drawn by most who realize this wider view of the growth of religion in the human history. The recognition of an order of Divine providence, embracing the development of the religious idea, negatives the supposition of petty interference in the way of material miracles. If without miracle, but in obedience to a providential order, the Persian appears in his fulness of time to spiritualize the Jewish monotheism and to purify the Jewish worship from idolatrous taint, can we suppose (other considerations concerning miracles and their evidence apart) that fire fell from heaven to prove the prophetic mission of Elijah, or that a dead man was reanimated by the touch of the bones of Elisha to prove nothing? On no account, however, should we omit to direct attention to two notes in a brief appendix, drawn up with a precision and clearness which leaves nothing to be desired, serving to prove that if Dean Stanley has forsaken the path of

the critic for more flowery plains, it has been from mere wilfulness. The first note sets forth the reasons which compel modern critics to consider the chapters of Isaiah, xl.—lxvi., as by a different hand from the earlier portion, and to belong to the period of the captivity; the second treats more generally of the dates and authorship of the "Sacred Books," pointing out that almost all of the historical books of the Old Testament are both anonymous and of complex authorship. From our own point of view, there are both many defects and much which is delusive in the present volume; but it is part of a really great design, and we hope it will be continued through the Apocryphal period, as the author gives some reason to expect.

The Rev. W. Houghton gracefully inscribes to the Bishop of Natal, as the inaugurator in England of "a new and happy epoch in Biblical science and religious thought," an Essay, accompanied with a translation, on the Song of Songs.[6] He reviews briefly the principal opinions which have been held by the Rabbins, the Christian Fathers, the Protestant Reformers, modern divines, and recent critics, concerning the design and meaning of the book. Perhaps no greater injury is inflicted in any part of the Authorized Version of the Bible on the English readers of it than in the headings to the chapters of "Solomon's Song." The translators no doubt fancied that a mystical interpretation of the Song, as descriptive of the "mutual love of Christ and his Church," was the only way of escape from a mere sensual exposition. There is, however, a growing consensus among the moderns, abandoning all allegorical interpretations, that the poem is a pastoral, describing the virtuous attachment of a village girl of Shulem to a young shepherd, which is proof against all the allurements of Solomon, who in the end allows her to leave the palace, to which she had been carried off, and to return to her rustic lover. The date of the composition of the poem appears to be assigned with reason, by Dr. Davidson, approximatively to the middle of the tenth century before Christ. Mr. Houghton also thinks, with Renan, that the poem, from its dramatic form, was probably intended for representation, not however, on the stage of a theatre, "no trace of which has ever been found among the Jews before the time of Herod, but in private rooms and at marriage festivals;" and he vindicates M. Renan's work against some narrow-minded strictures passed upon it in "Smith's Dictionary of the Bible." Every unprejudiced reader of this Essay will perceive that the cause of religion has nothing to lose, but everything to gain, from a more free and truthful exposition of the Biblical writings than has hitherto been common in this country.

Some of our readers may be aware that the Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly, has been accustomed, during the London season, to invite persons of various shades of opinion, clergy and laity, to meet for the discussion of questions of theological or ecclesiastical interest.[7] At one of these meetings, in the Lent of 1865, a paper was read by the Rev. Dr. Irons, the Vicar of Brompton, which for many of those present was of the most startling kind, and a general wish having been expressed for its publication, the public are presented with what really turns out to be a very curious production. It was probably not expected by the author that the views set forth in it concerning the inspiration, the interpretation, and the authority of Scripture would, *per se*, be acceptable to any party in this country except Dr. Irons's own, of whomsoever besides himself that may consist. To a certain extent his hand is against every man, but chiefly he is severe upon that which he calls the popular theory, the monobiblical theory, the Chillingworth basis; and he effectually shows that it is laid upon the sand. Before the Bible can be appealed to for the religion of Protestants it must be ascertained what the Bible is; even the learned are unable to fix the text of the Bible, much less to determine the authorship and dates of its several books, or the surrounding circumstances which attended the composition of them severally. The literary history of the Old Testament cannot be traced further back then the time of Ezra, so that the notion of Moses writing the Pentateuch in the Wilderness is unsupported by any external testimony; and that which Ezra is relatively to the Old Testament, Eusebius is to the New, and it is startling to perceive "how much of all the testimony of other Christian writers of the first 300 years depends on the veracity and care of that one man living in the fourth age." (p. 17.) Of earlier writers the most important is Justin, writing in the first half of the second century; but he does not once quote any Epistle of St. Paul, and (though he was furnished with the Gospel story) he was unacquainted, as Bishop Marsh thought, with the Gospels as Scripture, never quotes any of our present Gospels by name; but what is still more strange, St. Paul himself, writing thirty years after the Ascension, "never seems aware of the existence (for example) of St. Matthew or his Gospel." Moreover, no criticism has found out in what language the Lord Jesus uttered his discourses. If in Greek, did the Galileans understand Greek? If in Hebrew, the original words are for ever lost; and are we to suppose that what he spoke in Aramæan was brought afterwards to the remembrance of the compilers of the Gospels in Greek? The facts says Dr. Irons, are irreconcilable with the supposition "that God has given this sacred volume as His clear Revelation, which *all* men may test for themselves, and all must understand." (p. 19.) "The Roman theory" is next described as claiming for the Church, of which the Pope is the head, and "infallible," the control and settlement of Scripture, and of all questions of salvation con-

[6] "An Essay on the Canticles, or The Song of Songs. With a Translation of the Poem, and short Explanatory Notes." By the Rev. W. Houghton, M.A., F.L.S., Rector of Preston on the Wild Moors. London: Trübner. 1865.

[7] "The Bible and its Interpreters: The Popular Theory, The Roman Theory, The Literary Theory, The Truth." By William J. Irons, D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, &c. London: J. T. Hayes. 1865.

nected with it; and the author urges that this Roman Church pronounced nothing authoritative as to the Canon till the sixteenth century—has delivered no authoritative judgment whatever as to the text of the Bible; and he infers that "any claim on her part to paramount authority over the written word is contrary to every fact of history." (p. 59.) With the essential part of the Roman claims it seems to us that the author does not grapple—namely, that the Church is in possession of an "unwritten Word," which is determinant of the interpretation of the "written Word." He proceeds to what he calls "the literary theory," as a method considered in itself. "The popular theory" itself is a "literary theory," inasmuch as it supposes "God's vital message to the world is definitely made in writing;"—such an assumption is described as fallacy the first, because it is inconceivable that a Revelation in which all are interested should be communicated in such a way as to be practically inaccessible to ninety-nine out of a hundred. The second fallacy in the method is that it assumes the Bible to be like any other book, and that its interpretation is to be arrived at by the same means: an assumption which, however it may be made by the rationalizers, would be utterly repudiated by the popular Evangelicals. The third fallacy is, that it assumes the "written Word" "to be absolutely conterminous with all Revelation from God to man" —a view which would be as repulsive to the rationalizers as it would be acceptable to the Evangelicals. And fourthly, it is assumed that the capacity to examine and judge this Bible is *adequately* possessed by all concerned in its contents, which, if adequately is to mean perfectly, and relatively to the contents themselves, we suppose would be affirmed by none. In combating these assumptions, however, which are for the most part men of straw dressed up by himself, Dr. Irons again distributes at random some telling truths respecting the Bible and the doctrinal system which is supposed to be built upon it. "The doctrines," for instance, "of the (1) Trinity; (2) Atonement; (3) Original Sin; (4) The Sabbath; (5) The Sacraments; (6) The Inspiration of the Bible; and (7) Eternal Punishment," are not capable of demonstration from the Bible alone. (pp. 82, ff.) Not that the object of Dr. Irons is to impugn these doctrines—far from it—but to show the "literary believer" that he ought not to hold them; he will not allow the "literary believer" to hold the eternity of future punishment, because on the literary principle it cannot be proved from Scripture; nevertheless he must not disbelieve it, because it has been the constant doctrine of the Church. But what of the "literary *un*believer"? Will he be satisfied of the endless misery of the wicked because Dr. Irons infers it from their continued possession of reason and will, whence Dr. T. Burnet and others have inferred directly the reverse? Or will he accept it because it is the doctrine of Dr Irons's "Church"? For the lame and impotent conclusion of all this random criticism is, that "the truth" is to be found in "the Church." But what Church? "The millions" are only capable of receiving for answer to the question, "What is the Church?" "the society commonly received as such" (p. 147); but we rather gather that the society which was supernaturally organized on the day of Pentecost is supernaturally continued, according to Dr. Irons, by baptism administered by episcopally ordained ministers. Those who read Dr. Irons's book will probably be of the same opinion with his original audience, that he is much more effective in the destructive than in the constructive portion; but he is only effective against the temporizers: he demolishes nothing that is thorough, neither the thorough Calvinist, the thorough Romanist, nor the thorough Rationalist.

The celebrated *Tract* No. 90, published now nearly a quarter of a century ago, was currently reported to have been more or less founded upon the treatise of Sancta Clara, which is now reprinted.[8] The purpose of the *Tract*, as is well known, was to show, by means of certain explanations of the words of the Thirty-nine Articles, that they were not contradictory to the true Roman or Catholic doctrine, but only to popular Romish corruptions. The general Protestant feeling of the country resented the attempt to break down the barrier which the Articles were supposed to present against Popery; and, at least to a certain extent, the general feeling of the incompatibility of the Articles with the Roman Catholic doctrine was justified when Mr. Oakeley, having brought to a legal issue the "claim to hold all Roman doctrine," Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, in the Consistorial Court of London, pronounced against him, and he forthwith joined the Church of Rome. It is therefore very curious to find at this distance of time the treatise of Sancta Clara itself reprinted, apparently in the interest of the movement towards "reunion," as it is understood on the Roman Catholic side. Till within a few years it would have been more likely to repel than to conciliate, to have re-stated that—

> "notwithstanding the existence of expressions [in the Thirty-nine Articles] which *appear* strong at first sight, and before they are carefully examined, there can be little doubt, as both Sancta Clara and Tract 90 proved, that there are few propositions which may not be brought into perfect harmony with the current opinions of the rest of Western Christendom."—p. x.

We have not the least desire to enter into the examination of Sancta Clara's pleas, but will only observe that, if the bulk of the Thirty-nine Articles may be reconcileable with Roman Catholicism, it will be as little difficult to reconcile the five first with Unitarianism. But lest any should be misled by the statement that the "re-

[8] "Paraphrastica Expositio Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanæ: The Articles of the Anglican Church Paraphrastically Considered and Explained." By Franciscus A. Sancta Clara, S.T.P., (Dr. Christopher Davenport.) Reprinted from the edition in Latin of 1646, with a Translation, together with Expositions and Comments in English, from the theological problems and propositions of the same writer, and with additional notes and references. To which are prefixed an Introduction and a Sketch of the Life of the Author. Edited by F. G. Lee, D.C.L., &c. &c. London: J. T. Hayes. 1865.

cent manifestoes in the Church of England favourable to the quiet removal of the Thirty-nine Articles deserve the careful attention and proper respect of *all theological schools*," we are told immediately that "no single iota of the Truth of God would be lost," especially "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," and "whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith."

In the year 1857 an association was formed for the purpose of promoting the reunion of Christendom—that is, a reunion between the old Episcopal Communions on the basis of what is termed Catholic doctrine. The society is said to number 7000 persons, and has issued two volumes of sermons, of which the second series is before us.[9] They are not marked by any superiority of thought or diction; the best by far appears to us that by Mr. Bennett, the vicar of Frome. The operations of this society, we are rather inclined to think, so far from tending to unity, will tend to cross cut and divide Christendom more than it is divided at present. Meanwhile, these are the views expressed with respect to "Evangelicalism" and "Rationalism" in this country:—

"The advance of Rationalism, fraught as it is with the utmost danger to the salvation of many precious souls, does incidentally help to reduce, as, in the long run it may probably destroy altogether, the difficulty before us. It acts as a solvent upon the popular Evangelicalism. It precipitates the anti-sacramental negative element towards the pure Rationalism with which, under the name of Free Thought, it has the strongest and most radical affinities. It drives the adoring and actionary element upward, to take shelter from its devastating and unspiritual action in a sincere allegiance to the principle of Church authority."—p. 159.

A unity of a very different kind is seen by M. Colani to be the only possible one, if ever it shall be possible—a moral unity, notwithstanding intellectual differences.[10] Past history, as well as our own knowledge of the constitution of the human mind, assure us of the impracticability of ever attaining a doctrinal uniformity throughout Christendom. The principle of the ecclesiastical and dogmatical party is: Truth is one, and we have the possession of it; the Church, therefore, is one, for it is bounded by the possession of the truth, and all who are not with us are not members of the Church. M. Colani says, on the other hand, of the Church or Christendom of the future: "L'Église sera profondement divisée en fait d'opinions, elle sera intimement unie dans la vie religieuse." The essential difference in the two bases is this: the Sacerdotalists assume dogma to be the representation of objective truth, the Protestants acknowledge doctrine to be no more than the statement of opinion; on the former principle there can be no true charity between persons who differ, for they do not meet on equal grounds; on the latter, no differences can preclude charity, for no error of opinion implies necessarily an immoral perverseness. This is an excellent discourse, and it already speaks well for the Protestant Church, before whose assembled ministers it could be delivered. It will be long, we fear, before a bishop at a visitation, or a president at a conference in this country, will be found to give utterance to such truly Christian sentiments. Nevertheless, here and there are intimations of a like spirit, as in a sermon by the Rev. James Cranbrook, of Edinburgh, entitled "The Church of the Future."[11] He conceives that "all union, not compatible with perfect freedom of thought and expression, can only end in estrangement or in intellectual and moral death."

A singular fallacy pervades the Dean of Canterbury's "Meditations."[12] "Matters," he says, "of the same kind as these great truths are recognised in our ordinary lives; and a fair and candid mind is no more justified in refusing credence to these articles of our faith, than it is in ignoring the everyday phenomena of man's existence." (p. 4.) Can a person of education, and one set so high as a Dean in the English Church, gravely maintain that a fair and candid mind would be no more justified in refusing credence to the tradition of the Incarnation contained in Matt. i., Luke i., than in ignoring the everyday phenomenon of the birth of children in the order of nature? Dean Alford affects to relieve his theology of conventionalities, but so little is he able to relieve it of conventionalities of thought, if not of expression, that he misrepresents, in the grossest manner, a doubt or denial of miracle as a doubt or denial of God—"to deny interference with nature is to deny what we call the supernatural; in other words, and they have no right to shrink from it, there is no God." (p. 52.) A Dean ought to be able to see that this question is not concerning the supernatural, but concerning the mode of agency of the supernatural. With equal grossness, he infers that those who deny the miracles of Jesus must, if consistent with themselves, hold him to be an impostor and deceiver. Dean Alford's Greek Testament studies, however feeble and uncritical his own conclusions may be, must have acquainted him with the fact, that many persons do not consider the words in which Christ seems to have set up claims to miraculous powers and prophecy to be sufficiently authenticated to justify that conclusion. The "Meditations" themselves raise pretended difficulties (as they occur to no one) to solve them by answers which no one of an under-

[9] "Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom." Second Series. By Members of the Roman Catholic, Oriental, and Anglican Communions. London: J. T. Hayes. 1865.

[10] "Sermon pour l'Ouverture solennelle de la Session du Consistoire supérieur de l'Église de la Confession d'Augsbourg." Par T. Colani, Professeur à la Faculté de Théologie, &c. &c. 2ième edition. Strasbourg. Paris. 1865.

[11] "The Church of the Future, as Indicated by the Tendencies of Modern Thought and Feeling." By Rev. James Cranbrook, Albany Street Chapel, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: A. Fullarton. 1865.

[12] "Meditations in Advent, on Creation and on Providence." By Henry Alford, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. London: Alexander Strahan. 1865.

standing beyond a child's would accept; there are words of piety but no spirit of it, and somewhat high-flown language of rhetoric and description, but it is mere coloured surface and not painting.

We may here notice a pamphlet which is well worth reading, for the straightforwardness with which the author argues his point.[13] He adopts the supposition of a resuscitation of Jesus after the crucifixion. In the course of his examination of the evidence of the Evangelists, he follows very closely the explanations of their discrepancies attempted to be given by the Dean in his Commentary, and necessarily has to say some very pointed things, which we hope the Dean has read. We wish some competent person would follow that dignitary in like manner throughout his annotations. One thorough scholar commenced it, as we know, for the Greek Testament, but threw up the undertaking in utter weariness and disgust.

It has often been supposed that the peopling of the American continent must have taken place by means of communication from the north-east of Asia, and we are not at all justified in limiting that communication to a single emigration. M. Gustave d'Eichthal has attempted to establish a connection between the ancient Mexican civilization and that of eastern Asia,[14] and more especially to show a Buddhist influence in the sculptures of the ruined city of Palenque. Some of the correspondences which he points out between American and Asiatic superstitions may be accounted for on the principle of analogical development; others seem to imply historical derivation, and the paper is well worth the attention of travellers.

Mr. Cox's "Literature of the Sabbath Question" is a collection, the result of great painstaking and research.[15] First are given *in extenso* all the passages in the Bible which have any allusion to, or bearing on the subject. Then come references to the opinions of the Fathers; but the great bulk of the work consists of extracts from a vast number of writers who have treated the question, from the time of the Reformation to the present day—Continental, English, Scotch, and American authorities. Some of these extracts are very curious, and from volumes rarely met with. The consequence of a study of this great mass of information would inevitably be to induce increased forbearance and charity in the conduct of a discussion on which men's passions are the more inflamed because none of the extreme parties are able to prove that their opponents are in all things entirely in the wrong. There is added an index, rendered necessary by the extent of the literature thus brought together.

We do not wonder that the views of the mode in which Divine Providence operates, and in which God may be said to answer prayer, set forth by the Rev. James Cranbrook, should have exposed him to some vehement attacks in the northern capital.[16] His principle is, that "God always works through, and never suspends the action of the established laws of nature." Thus the world is governed by a "natural" and not a "supernatural Providence." Limiting the question as he has done, he has sufficiently secured his position, reconciled his doctrine with Biblical figures of speech, supported himself by the authority of Bishop Butler, and shown himself in substantial unison with Dr. Chalmers.

Mr. Hopkins is much more misty in his treatment of the question of the Divine law and order in the universe;[17] nevertheless, he takes care to relieve himself of the necessity for substantiating the Biblical miracles. So true is it, as the late Professor Powell stated, that instead of the support they have become the burden of Christianity. Mr. Hopkins says that they did not serve to convert unbelievers who had witnessed them, much less can they be expected to convince those who only hear of them by a distant echo. Mr. Hopkins's Christianity, however, appears to consist in the reception of the mysteries, as of the Trinity and Incarnation, by faith; and instead of any proof of them, from which he acknowledges he is cut off, he thinks it suffices to produce the Butlerian argument, that as great difficulties meet us in the natural universe as in Revelation; forgetting that a reference to human ignorance, which will suffice in the case wherein we know the facts by experience to make us content without a solution of difficulties concerning the how, ought by no means to satisfy us where the facts themselves are altogether hypothetical and incapable of verification.

The very learned Dr. Ginsburg has given a lucid introduction to the system of the Kabbalah, a theosophic system professing to solve the great problems of God and the universe.[18] Its principal doctrines are: 1. "God is boundless in his nature. He has neither will, intention, desire, thought, language, nor action." He is therefore called *En Soph* (without limit), "and as such He is, in a certain sense, not existent." 2. He is not the direct creator of the universe, inasmuch as he is without will. 3. He sent forth ten emanations, or *Sephiroth*, "begotten, not made, which are both infinite

[13] "The Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ as given by the four Evangelists, critically examined." London: Williams and Norgate. 1865.

[14] "Etude sur les Origines Bouddhiques de la Civilisation Américaine." Par M. Gustave d'Eichthal. 1ère partie. Extrait de la Revue Archéologique. Paris. 1865.

[15] "The Literature of the Sabbath Question." By Robert Cox, F. S. A. Scot. In two volumes. Edinburgh: Maclachlan and Stewart. 1865.

[16] "Divine Providence in its Relations to Prayer and Plagues." By the Rev. James Cranbrook, Albany Street Chapel, Edinburgh. 2nd edition. Edinburgh and London: Fullarton and Co. 1865.

[17] "A Reasonable Faith." By John Baker Hopkins. London: Longmans. 1865.

[18] "The Kabbalah: its Doctrines, Development, and Literature." An Essay. By Christian D. Ginsburg, LL.D. Read before the Literary and Scientific Society of Liverpool, and reprinted with the Society's permission. London: Longmans. 1865.

and finite." It is not, however, agreed whether these *Sephiroth* are to be regarded as *principles*, or as *substances*, or as *potencies*, or as intelligent worlds, or as *attributes*, or as *entities* or as *organs of the Deity*. (p. 7, note.) 4. From the *Sephiroth* the different worlds are successively evolved. 5. And give rise to all human souls, which are pre-existent. 6. The anthropomorphisms of Scripture refer to the *Sephiroth*, and not to the Invisible—the *En Soph*. 7. The soul must return to its infinite source. If it fails in this life to develop the germs inherent in it, it must migrate into another body, and be associated with a stronger soul. 8. "When all the pre-existent souls shall have passed their probationary period here below, the restitution of all things will take place. Satan will be restored to an angel of light, hell will disappear, and all souls will return into the bosom of the Deity whence they emanated." (pp. 64, 65.) The principal books of the Kabbalists are: I. The Book of Creation (Jetzira). II. The Sohar; and III. The Commentary of the ten Sephiroth. The Jetzira, however, which is of about the ninth century, is not properly a Kabbalistic work; the Sohar is the principal repository of those doctrines. The most learned recent writers assign the Sohar to the thirteenth century; the Commentary on the Sephiroth belongs to the eleventh. The method by which the Kabbalists extracted their theosophic doctrines from the sacred writings was by a system of acrostic readings and permutations of the letters of the text, by which means, indeed, anything could be made out of anything; and accordingly, some Christians have found in this Kabbalistic method of reading the Old Testament confirmations of the doctrines of Christianity. Among Christian scholars and divines who have adopted the Kabbalistic system were Reuchlin the friend of Erasmus, Picus di Mirandola, Robert Fludd, and Dr. Henry More. Among the Jews themselves the tendency of the Kabbalistic studies has been in the direction of Christianity. Dr. Ginsburg's is a very excellent and by no means burdensome introduction to the subject.

Miss Hennell's "Present Religion" must be studied by those who are prepared for it.[19] We can only indicate the germinant principle on which it is founded. When it comes to be laid down that all human conceptions of the Deity must be anthropomorphic, and therefore in different degrees inadequate and false, the upholders of a supernatural revelation, even orthodox theists, assert that this amounts to making God a creature of human imagination, and is no other than Atheism. But, says Miss Hennell, if we think of God, not as acting apart from other action, but as the source of all action, and therefore also of human action, it will follow that he is the source of all religion, not, indeed, *directly*, but *indirectly*. "If God did not directly make the religion, yet he made the mind that made the religion;" and though the working of the mind was "not a direct operation, any more than the other, yet the representation will to the last include the whole essential truth of the matter." (p. 9.) According to this principle, human religion has been in constant course of development from the lower fetichistic forms in which fear is predominant, to such as the Christian, which acknowledges the Divine Fatherhood and human responsibility. Thus, not only is the highest place assigned to Christianity in the history of the religious development of humanity, but even its several doctrines, although of subjective origin, were necessary stages in that religious growth.

The treatise of Dr. Travis on "Moral Freedom" undoubtedly possesses the merit of having stated the problem to be solved in a distinct manner.[20] There are two fundamental questions, he says, involved in the controversy respecting the freedom of the will: "1st. Whether the law of causation extends to the formation of man's volitions. 2nd. Whether man has a power of self-determination." Usually, those who answer one of these affirmatively deny the other. Dr. Travis affirms both, and thereby reconciles, as he conceives, human liberty—not with necessity, compulsion, or fatalism—but with the universality of causation. He arrives at this conclusion by an analysis of the process of self-determination. After clearing away various psychological errors—and principally this, that the mind is a separate entity and living thing within our organism—he observes on the distinction, hitherto, as he considers, not clearly pointed out, between mental affections and mental acts. "The power to attend," he defines as "the power to keep up thoughts or external perceptions by means of bodily acts suited to the accomplishment of this result;" and although the power to retain thoughts, or the impressions of external objects, operates by means of our organism, yet it is a mental power. And the retaining one thought rather than another, the looking at one object rather than another, is determined by the will, which therein gives preference to one motive over another. Now we doubt whether Dr. Travis has here wrought out the even-handed solution which he undertook. For the will, or rather the particular act of willing, is itself determined by wish, and the character of the then present wish is determined by the whole of the antecedents and circumstances belonging to the agent. So that there is an ambiguity in the expression "self-determination." Dr. Travis would certainly not say that a particular act of will is self-determined, in the sense determined without motive, or as a choice between motives by way of a toss-up; but he would quite acknowledge that each particular act of will is determined by a particular wish, and that the particular

[19] "Present Religion: as a Faith owning Fellowship with Thought." By Sara S. Hennell, author of "Thoughts in Aid of Faith." Part I. London: Trübner and Co. 1865.

[20] "Moral Freedom reconciled with Causation by the Analysis of the Process of Self-determination. The Moral Basis of Social Science. With a Postscript on Co-operation." By Henry Travis, M.D. London: Longmans. 1865.

wish depends upon the then character of the "self," as a product of all its antecedents. The sense of "good" and the sense of "duty" which determine an act of will are consequences of these antecedents; and hence we think Dr. Travis has only succeeded in reconciling the doctrine of the Universality of Causation with the fact that man has a power of self-determination, according to a signification of the latter word inconsistent with that in which most libertarians would accept it. The practical inferences which he draws (pp. 32, 178) from the doctrine of the Universality of Causation as embracing moral phenomena concerning the obligations of men to each other in society, are very valuable.

There could not be a more vigorous and damaging onslaught on Hamiltonianism than that of Mr. Stirling.[21] The more damaging because we have here the result of an unprejudiced examination of the writings of that celebrated logician; at least a small portion, or *échantillon*. The present treatise is confined to a criticism of Hamilton's theory of Perception, and is divided into sections: "1. Hamilton both presentationist and phenomenalist; 2. The testimony of consciousness, or Hamilton's ὅτι; 3. The analysis of philosophy, or Hamilton's διότι; and 4. The principle of common sense." We have then (1) two series of citations. In the former occur such utterances as these: "I hold that Perception is an Immediate or Presentative, not a Mediate or Representative, cognition," and "To be known immediately, an object must be known in itself" (pp. 2—4.); in the latter, "Whatever we know, is not known as it is, but only as it seems to us to be;" "of things absolutely, or in themselves, we know nothing." (pp. 5—8.) He therefore seems to assert at one time that the object known is the real existence; at another, that we only know phenomena. The question thus arises, Why did Hamilton, whose polemic is ostensibly for presentationalism or immediate perception, give us also representationalism? Or "Why did Hamilton, without sense of contradiction, as it seems, assert at once knowledge and ignorance of things in themselves?" (p. 26.) The answer seems to be, that the external reality is presented in a phenomenon. "However phenomenally wrapped up, the non-ego is actually presented to the ego. Presentation of a phenomenon is Hamilton's conviction; what dominates him is, that the non-ego is *actually there*." (p. 30.) Hence arises a controversy as between Kant and Hamilton, for to Kant likewise the "non-ego is actually there," though he would deny the immediate intuitive and face-to-face cognition of it; then will come in Hamilton's appeal to the testimony of consciousness—that it is so. "Consciousness," he says, "can state no falsehood; but consciousness asserts the fact of immediate contact with an externality different from itself, therefore such externality *is*." (p. 46.) But, says Mr. Stirling, "were consciousness inviolable in the sense in which it must be understood to legitimate the conclusion of Hamilton in regard to the evidence of perception, then the tale of history is a dream, for that whole tale is but the transcendance of error after error, and these errors were the errors of consciousness." (p. 56.) Nevertheless, though he will not allow it to others, Hamilton himself will put consciousness to further questions. More consistently Hegel is able "to transcend yet hold consciousness. Philosophy, he says, begins by riding *over* ordinary consciousness; appealing from ordinary to universal consciousness." (p. 65.) Hamilton, however, is thus driven from the sufficiency of the immediate deliverance of the ordinary consciousness into a philosophical analysis of what it is that consciousness ultimately testifies. Here comes in the theory of Hamilton concerning the interposition of a nervous network between the percipient mind and the external reality, fatal at once to any theory of presentationism or immediate perception, properly so called. Finally, Hamilton falls back on the verification of the testimony of consciousness by common sense. But, "it is common sense, yet the result of *analysis, critical* analysis, and by the *philosophers*. It is common sense, but not the sense of the common (the vulgar); it is the sense of the uncommon (the philosophers)." And Mr. Stirling concludes, "It was Hamilton's pride to have perfected the presentationism of Reid, to have strengthened into impregnability his fortress of common sense: in reality, he has but overthrown the one and broken up the other." (p. 123.) The admirers of Sir William Hamilton should seriously set to work to repair their damaged idol.

Dugald Stewart's mind was not that of an original thinker, but he rendered in his day great service, in modifying, assimilating, and communicating the thoughts of others. His treatment of his subject was often defective and often loose; but his style commended it to the attention of pupils and readers. His "Outlines of Moral Philosophy"[22] were prepared by him as a text-book for his own class, in 1793; and with such additions and corrections as each teacher must supply for himself, may still be usefully employed for the same purpose. Dr. M'Cosh has added to this edition an Appendix, embracing such rectifications of his author as seem to him to be required, together with a set of questions useful for purposes of examination.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES, AND TRAVELS.

As might be expected, Professor Fawcett's lectures on the economical condition of the

[21] "Sir William Hamilton: being the Philosophy of Perception." An Analysis. By James Hutchinson Stirling. Author of "The Secret of Hegel." London: Longmans. 1865.

[22] "Outlines of Moral Philosophy." By Dugald Stewart, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Edinburgh. With a Memoir, a Supplement, and Questions. By James M'Cosh, LL.D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Queen's University in Ireland, &c. &c. London: William Allan. 1865.

labouring classes[1] are quite free from a certain tone of antagonism to the truths of political economy, which has displayed itself of late in the treatment which this subject has received at less well-informed hands. This antagonism is, for the most part, based upon a misrepresentation of economic doctrines, which would almost lead us to suppose that the writers in question, though some of them ought least of all to be in that position, have no clear perception of the term natural law. Whatever some writers on economy may have been led to assert, no completely instructed economist now claims any greater force or cogency for the laws of economy than is claimed for other laws of nature, or supposes that they have any other efficiency than that which can be inferred from a constantly observed tendency, when not counteracted by an opposing force. But even those writers who have used stronger language, and apparently asserted an inherent force in the laws in question, ought in common fairness to receive the most favourable construction that is compatible with their expressions: for it was quite natural in those who discovered, or were among the first to realize, an unrecognised relation between two sets of phenomena, to give, in their exposition of the relation itself, a greater prominence to the new fact they wished to make known than to the attendant circumstances under which it was usually hidden. No law in nature was ever discovered except by the elimination of such circumstances as either hindered its action or obscured its recognition. The discovery itself does not destroy these circumstances nor deny their existence. But it would be too much to expect that those who first arrived at it should cloud the expression of their discovery with an account of every modifying condition which may affect the action of the law in question. Political arguments against economical truth are as much out of place as complaints against gravitation, because it conduces, under fitting circumstances, to broken necks. The laws of economy are as relentless as gravitation itself, but are as consistent with the highest moral excellence as gravitation is with the most ethereal beauty, but only on the same condition—that they are recognised and obeyed. It is an utter narrowness to declaim against the laws which regulate the production, distribution, and exchange of wealth, because they do not in their terms proclaim other laws with which, in their definition at least, they are not concerned; and the more so as the very truths in question can never arrive at an ultimate clearness of expression without the aid of the laws they are made use of to invalidate. It is not by refusing to the hard trunk and less graceful leafage the sustenance they require that the lovely flower can be made more readily to display its complete beauties. But as we have just said, these remarks have no reference to Professor Fawcett; he is too well-informed on this subject to be misled into such vagaries, and the natural consequence is, that he appears to offer much less to those who are discontented with the operation of economical laws than is delusively held forth by men who, with less knowledge, choose to deny their validity. But his book is not the less instructive on this account. It would be strange, indeed, if the way to all imaginable happiness were as easily accessible as the means of drawing on our imagination for a lively picture of what appears to us to represent it. With the patience of science he is content to talk of the tenure of land, of primogeniture, of co-operation, emigration, and strikes—no novelties it is true, but they involve immediate and attainable ameliorations of a state of things which he deplores with as much vivacity and feeling as any of the opposite school of which we have just spoken. Although he constantly deprecates the use of political arguments, most of the turning points of his discussion turn on political questions. His explanation of the economical results of the practice of entailing real estate on the unborn child of the youngest party to the contract is full, complete and satisfactory; but it may be fairly questioned whether, in the present condition of English agriculture, its legislative removal would tend to the disruption of landed estates and to the origination of a class of peasant proprietors like our extinct yeomen. If land were as freely exchangeable as cotton goods, the nature of the chief crops which can be raised in England is so favourable to the existence of large farms, that it may be questioned whether we should ever again see the system of small cultivation prevalent in this island. The economy which is the result of employing machinery in farming is beyond the means of small capitalists, and this is an economy which the inventions of every year make more and more important. But there are other and social causes which contribute to the same result; so long as our system of parliamentary representation is based on the present local distribution of constituencies, it will ever tend to keep land together in large masses, whether it be freely saleable or not. Money as such gives, except in the centres of commerce, but very little political or even social influence to its possessors, but money invested in land at once confers a local power and influence that cannot but be recognised by the neighbours of the newest man. In London aristocratic exclusiveness is amenable to no laws but those of its own establishment, but in the provinces nothing but the system of entails would long support family and political influence. If the practice were once legally prohibited, the price of land would, in our opinion, rather rise than fall. The desired access to the best society would be at once attainable to those who were willing to pay for it, and even in cases where personal peculiarities stood in the purchaser's way, his son would find what had been denied to himself. In a wealthy country like our own, these considerations would always tend to keep land in large estates, and its price above its true agricultural value, from causing its possession to be desired for other than merely remunerative purposes. It is not by the abolition of entails, however desirable such a measure may be, but by a thorough change in the basis

[1] "The Economic Position of the British Labourer." By H. Fawcett, M.P. London: Macmillan and Co., 1865.

of the representation, that land can be brought within the scope of the possible means of the lower classes. If, indeed, our representation were of a direct personal character, the adventitious value of landed estates would of course be immediately destroyed, and with it much of the variety of English society. Whether that variety is worth its cost is indeed another question, and we are very much indeed of the opinion that Englishmen sacrifice as much to the adornment of the capitals of their social edifice as the Athenians did to the adornment of their acropolis, but with canons of taste of a quite different order. On co-operation, wages, and emigration, there is nothing new in Professor Fawcett's pages, unless it be found in a discussion of the question, whether we are not in danger of the last becoming excessive. This question, however, can hardly yet be said to have assumed a practical shape. On strikes the whole truth is very fairly told; the operative's right is fully conceded, and a very necessary distinction drawn between a strike and that organization by which it is usually directed and governed. A trade union is most legitimately employed when it enables its members to mass themselves against capital; and when it has also directed its energies to a thorough investigation of the particular question in dispute between the employer and the employed, it always has been, and always must be, successful. The vices of these combinations are not to be discovered in their conflicts with employers, though sometimes these conflicts betray a regretable ignorance, but are to be found in the means which are too often employed by their members to force independent and unwilling labourers in any particular trade to join their ranks. Open violence has become, in some degree, less audacious than in former years, and ought to be promptly suppressed; but the law cannot reach every injustice, and one of Professor Fawcett's great merits is, that in spite of his warm feeling for the labouring classes, he does not shrink from the warning and exposure which is called for by many of the proceedings of these societies. In this respect he is far above that flattery which Cromwell rebuked in Sir Peter Lely, when he told him to paint him with all his warts. These lectures are in some degree encumbered with elementary matter, but perhaps this was unavoidable in a course originally composed for educational purposes.

One would naturally suppose from such a title as "Three Years among the Working Classes in the United States"[2] that the book to which it was given treated of the working classes in question. This, however, is by no means the case with an otherwise clever and apparently honest account of American society, just published by Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co. The author was indeed a "working man," but a singularly well-informed one, and it is consequently the more to be regretted that he should be tempted to stray so far beyond the ground indicated in his title, as it will be long before so capable a person will have so good an opportunity of giving us full particulars of all the points in which the relations between employer and employed in America differ from those in England. The picture he draws is not attractive to those who place their ideal of character in moderation and self-control, but it is very short-sighted so violently to condemn Americans because they do not possess virtues against which every circumstance of their position is in constant warfare. Sudden prosperity, with unlimited means of self-support and probable wealth, are not conducive to modesty in those who can look upon such gifts of fortune as their natural birthright; and yet, at the conclusion of the most high-coloured of the author's pictures, he is constantly obliged to confess that their most striking features are taken from natives of the British isles or from their immediate descendants. Indeed, nothing is more indisputable than the fact that what is most offensive to Englishmen in the American character may be found in our own, and that much English feeling for our American descendants is but the counterpart of that entertained towards ourselves in most nations of the Continent, and may be traced to the same origin. The author of this volume, though very competent as an original observer, is evidently so much of a reading man that he prefers to support his own opinions by those of American papers in spite of his constant denunciations of their uncompromising partizanship. This book, notwithstanding, deserves attention, though it calls for frequent modification. He was necessarily thrown among the unsettled classes of American society, and came in very slight contact with what may be truly called national and American manners. The fluctuating population of the great American towns gives but a very poor idea of the general features of American character. In such places it is overlaid by all the unprincipled elements of the enormous immigration which constantly pours itself on the shores of the United States. One of the best chapters in the book contains a very full account of the benevolent supervision on which all immigrants may rely on their arrival at New York. The Emigration Commission, which sits at Castle Garden in that city, is an institution to which Americans may point as without its parallel in the world, and is worthy of the highest admiration. The thoughtlessness and intemperance of our own working-classes, however they may be excused by the hopelessness of their position, find no analogue among the corresponding classes in America. The free career which is there open to all, and the constant sense of personal independence, call forth at least an endeavour to assume the appearance of the better classes; and though this endeavour is, as might be expected, very often guided by an execrable taste, it yet conduces to a general prosperity, which affords the best basis for improvement in manners also. We have ourselves made too great an advance towards that weakening of the tie between parents and children which so shocked the author in America, to be much surprised at his report. Our own

[2] "Three Years among the Working Classes in the United States during the War." By the author of "The Autobiography of a Beggar Boy." London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

grandfathers would be as greatly shocked if they could hear our children, as anyone can be at American freedom in this respect. Yet we should tell our ancestors, as the Americans doubtlessly would tell us, that filial devotion is as common now—where it is justly due—as ever it was in the world's history. On the whole, this book, though amusing and well-written, is too much occupied with the surface of things and the first impressions derived from them, to be as instructive as many will find it entertaining.

Although Mr. Nicholson's "Science of Exchanges"[3] is unfortunately deformed by a dedication to Lord Overstone in the worst possible taste—which might induce many who read it to suppose that the contents of the volume were much less valuable than they really are—this catechism on the principal terms used in political economy, in spite of the acknowledged difficulty of giving exact and succinct definitions, is so clear and well-arranged that it cannot fail to be of service to all who are entering on the study of the science of which it treats. The principles advocated throughout its pages are those of the most competent authorities, and on the question of currency and banking the author leaves very little to be said that would add to the excellence of his Exposition.

"The Organisation of Credit"[4] is just now the stalking horse most in favour with the opponents of the Bank Act of 1844. There is an imposing magnificence about the phrase that is highly attractive, and a vagueness of meaning that will admit of any kind of confusion. Before we set about organising credit, it would be as well to have some definite notion of what we mean by the word. Credit means confidence: a man's credit is good so long as it is confidently believed that he can meet his engagements; it reposes on personal character, so that at last it would seem that the organisation of credit calls for a similar organisation of character in those who lay claims to it. This is an organisation which the world has been engaged in striving after ever since the commencement of human society, but it has not usually been called by that name; and we think that when credit can be in any proper sense organised, there will be but little left for the lawgiver's labours. The millennium of universal confidence is only to be expected in a future as distant as that of universal brotherly love. We strongly recommend the following words of Isaiah as an epigraph to such impatient theorists as M. Pereire and the author of a book recently published, with this taking title: "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money: come ye, buy and eat—yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." This is the commercial millennium, upon which, in the opinion of the author, we could at once enter, were it not for perverse legislation and an unaccountable prejudice which some people share with Hamlet, against feeding on air "promise crammed." One is almost tempted to regret that such a thing as a bank-note was ever invented, when we have to wade through nearly five hundred pages of elaborate argument to prove that every instrument, or means of commercial liquidation, has as good a title to be called currency. The basis on which this theory is built is, that bank-notes are a substitute for, and not merely a representative of the money for which they pass current—that it is their function to economise the capital they represent instead of merely saving the wear and tear of the metal which would otherwise be needed, and supplying an instrument of easier manipulation The Act of 1844 has long been the scapegoat of those who find it easier to criticise an act of Parliament than to investigate the real nature of the circumstances it was passed to meet. If the proper definition of currency be "whatever represents transferrible debt," bank-notes and coin are something more than currency, for they not only transfer but pay debts. At page 31 the author says—"Capital and credit constitute the circulating medium," and the whole object of his volume is to show that it is the interest and duty of the Government and of the Bank of England to take care that if any trader exhaust the first of these constituents, he should never be in want of the second. "The object aimed at (p. 45) should be to preserve a uniform rate of discount in this country, and at the same time to maintain a uniformity in the value of the British currency with that of other countries." As it cannot be denied that this result is unattainable without loss to someone, the simple course proposed—and it appears to us to be simple in more than one sense—is that the Government and the Bank of England should come to some agreement by which it could be shared between them. This would be, in effect, to tax the whole community for the purpose of expunging the debit side of profit and loss from the ledger of every merchant in the country. Pleasing, if only practical! and it is much to be regretted that such a consummation is not as attainable as it is certainly attractive. Because the bank rate of discount proclaims the price of disposable capital, it is supposed to be the cause of that price; and the bank is blamed at page 150 for "the means by which it raises the rate of discount when money is most wanted"!! Why not carry out the argument a little further, and say that when money is most wanted it should be supplied by the bank gratuitously? The author quotes "Historicus" to this effect: "It is a lamentable but certain fact that the hardest and best work that is done in the world is often that which is least appreciated." Of one thing we are certain, that if the hardest work were also always the best, the merit of those who have gone through every page in the present volume ought to be highly appreciated.

To turn from these pages to those of a pamphlet by Mr. Stirling on "Banks and Bank Management,"[5] is like leaving a region of cloud

[3] "The Science of Exchanges." By N. A. Nicholson, M.A. 3rd edition. London: E. Wilson. 1865.

[4] "The Bank of England, and the Organisation of Credit in England." London: Longmans and Co. 1865.

[5] "Practical Considerations on Banks and Bank

and fog for one of clear air and unrestricted vision. It is an absolute refreshment to meet with such sound sense and clear statement as are to be found in these "practical considerations;" and it is the more necessary to call attention to them, as most people have — and very justly too—an instinctive dread of currency discussions. There is but one point on which we think Mr. Stirling betrays prejudice; we mean in his violent hostility to the principle of limited liability. Its abuses ought not to be its condemnation; its first essays ought not to be deemed conclusive as to the results which are to be expected when the principle shall be better understood, and when it is protected, as it should be, by a perfect publicity given to the operations of those who avail themselves of its advantages. The distinction we have often drawn between the principles of currency and those of banking, has in no place, that we are aware of, been better illustrated than in this pamphlet. To us it seems not only conclusive but exhaustive, and we cannot do better than recommend all who are interested in these subjects to make themselves acquainted with the masterly argumentation by which Mr. Stirling supports his conclusion :—

"It is abundantly shown that the time has come for a courageous reform of our monetary laws; severing thoroughly and for ever the ill-starred conjunction of currency and banking, and establishing each on the principles appropriate to its nature. Such a law would be the wise and necessary complement to the Acts of 1819 and 1844, and would sweep away a world of perplexity, both theoretical and practical. For a time no doubt it would, like them, be subjected to the cavils of the uninstructed, but the mass of the intelligence of the country would be on the side of reform. Slowly, but surely, truth would assert its supremacy, and in a few short years the world would look back in wonder how it could have been so mystified as to the nature of a bank-note, or have so egregiously mistaken the influences which regulate the rate of interest."

In a very clear review of the operations of the "patent laws,"[6] Mr. Edwards contends for their total abolition. He starts by distinguishing copyright from protection to inventions of a mechanical character; and contends that in the former it is a definite and complete result that is protected, while in the latter it is but a means to an end, and that probably not the best means, while yet the privilege granted may be obstructive of further improvements; for it by no means follows that the first apprehension of a new constructive principle is always connected with the best adaptation of which it is susceptible. To meet those objections which would naturally arise from this apparent disregard of the claims of inventors, he subjects the returns of the Patent Office to a very complete analysis, and finds that not more than fifteen per cent. of the projects preliminarily registered proceed to the condition of full patents. At the same time, he gives very good reasons to suppose that, even of these, many are retained from other causes than their remunerative character :—

"The present law allows the inventor to lodge a petition for a patent on the payment of the sum of five pounds, which may be considered to be equivalent to provisional protection. He would have four months to mature his plans, and, if he resolved to proceed, he could obtain his patent for three years from the date of his first application on the payment of a total further sum of twenty pounds. At the expiration of these years, his privilege might be extended for a further period of four years on the payment of fifty pounds; and at the expiration of the seventh year from the date of his patent, he might extend his rights for another period of seven years on the payment of one hundred pounds; thus making protection to last for a total period of fourteen years at an expense of one hundred and seventy-five pounds, exclusive of agents' charges."

The effect of this straining process is given in the result just mentioned: not more than two hundred projects out of three thousand applications for patents survive to become remunerative to their possessors, while, even of these, many are retained from the accidental circumstance that their inventors are in sufficiently good circumstances to pay for a mere hobby, and many more to serve as advertisements to their other business. The lamentable history of really important mechanical inventions is told very fully by Mr. Edwards. The necessity of leaving the patentee to defend his privilege cannot be avoided, while the extreme difficulty of proving absolute originality, or of drawing up a specification that shall be secure against every attack, exposes the really meritorious inventor to such an overwhelming probability of ruin in the defence of his privilege, that very few indeed have been able to maintain their ground. Thus, while it would seem that imperfect inventions, when once patented, become an obstacle to further progress, the really important patents are defended with so much difficulty and risk, that a title to make the attempt becomes a questionable privilege. The patent laws thus become a lottery, and this peculiarity is perhaps one source of their attractiveness to the sanguine minds of those who would avail themselves of them; but they are in this respect worse than other lotteries, that the blanks are not merely simple loss to those who draw them. Whether some organised system of honorary rewards would not be far more conducive to the general welfare is a question worthy of the most serious consideration.

The second series of "Conservative Essays," by Mr. Nicholas,[7] of Louisville, Kentucky, is chiefly interesting as a specimen of the violence with which political discussion is carried on in the United States. His abhorrence of the war is only to be matched by his disgust at the means which have brought it to an end. It seems to him the height of treason to the constitution that *six weeks* should elapse after the

Management." By J. Stirling. Author of "Letters from the Slave States." Glasgow : D. Maclehose. 1865.

[6] "On Letters Patent for Inventions." By J. Edwards, jun. London : R. Hardwicke. 1865.

[7] "Conservative Essays, Legal and Political." By S. S. Nicholas, of Louisville, Kentucky. Philadelphia : Lippincott and Co. 1865.

termination of the struggle, and that there should still remain recognisable traces of the measures called forth by its exigencies. He calls himself a Conservative, and appeals to law, because slavery has been abolished in an extra-legal manner, and prophesies that, after that model, every obstacle will be removed that stands in the way of the hated republican majority. His lofty appeals to principle and constant moral bathos cannot be better shown than in the following extract from a criticism on Mr. Seward's plan for a railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Among other reasons, Mr. Seward had contended that such a railway was desirable as a means of introducing society in the recesses of the Continent: "What," says Mr. Nicholas, "is the particular motive for introducing society into the recesses of the Continent he does not explain; and it is not easy to conjecture what his motive may be, unless he wants population there merely because they are recesses, and because of the difficulty of governing the population after he has got it there. Those recesses belong to and are inhabited by the Indian tribes. Every principle of good faith and national honour requires that we should permit them to retain those remote recesses, *so long as their possession is compatible with our national weal, or at least with our national convenience.*" This is "border" politics, and, we must confess, we like the frank ruffianism of the South far better. The tone of this extract is exactly typical of the feelings of the Border States, which fully sympathising with neither of the parties to the late conflict, wished to take advantage of both, and incurred the natural consequence of such vacillation by becoming their battle-field; hence the passionate virulence of those Essays, which more resemble a series of exasperated leading articles than a collection of materials for future history, in which character the author collects and republishes them.

Let no one be deluded by the general title of M. de Liefde's book.[8] Its real purpose is the glorification of the Evangelical Confession by an account of its works of benevolence. At the same time, let it not be supposed that we would desire to take one jot or tittle from the well-deserved admiration which is due to the founders of most of the charities described in these two volumes. But their exclusive devotion to the establishments connected with one form only of Christian belief, ought in common honesty to have been fully indicated on the title-page. An excellent book still remains to be written on the various exertions which are made in all parts of Europe to care for forsaken children and reform dissolute adults, but it must not be drowned in sectarian sentiment, nor deformed by intolerance. The present volumes may perhaps be delightful reading to the religious party of their author; but those who belong to any other will find the facts they would so willingly be made acquainted with so deeply buried under a phraseology which is revolting to every educated person, that they are almost as inaccessible as if the book had never been written.

In "La Mère," M. Eugène Pelletan[9] takes up the argument and position of M. Legouvé in his "Histoire Morale des Femmes;" but though he goes over the same ground, it is only to pick up and bring into greater prominence certain details of the subject which his predecessor had with greater judgment merely indicated. To prove the fact that with the progress of ease, wealth, and security in society, the position of women is even more essentially modified than that of men, it was not necessary to gather into one unsavoury bouquet all the stories of degradation and vice which can be connected with the history of the sex. If it is asserted on the other hand that the only rational method of investigation in such subjects is the historical one, and that it is mere weakness to shrink from anything which this method brings before us, it is a sufficient answer in the present case to say, that without precise references and direct documentary evidence, the method in question is not followed, but merely parodied. There is no reference to authorities throughout the whole volume; but a few inadequate notes at its end are expected to supply the place of evidence that is called for on every page. The general positions taken up are for the most part judicious, but their illustration is devoid of the moral tact absolutely required in a book intended for general reading. We do not find that, after M. Legouvé's publication, such a volume as the present was at all called for.

Military men who have been in the habit of turning for information on the art of war to the bulky tomes of the *aide mémoire*, will gladly welcome the publication of a volume,[10] which in 204 not closely-printed pages purposes, according to Marshal Marmont, the author, "to give within restricted limits an account of the spirit of military operations, organization, and institutions," and, according to Captain Lendy, the translator, to be "an original treatise of modern *data* which may be used as a standard." The book is divided into four parts: the general theory of military art; the organization, formation, and maintenance of armies; the various operations of war; and the philosophy of war. We are at the outset surprised to find, after being recommended to read the "Mémoires of Montholon," and the writings of Marshal Gouvion St. Cyr and M. de Segur, such a large subject as the first so summarily dismissed; but as we read on, we find that the whole book is designed for the guidance only of those in command. All the Marshal has to say of the theory of military art has been better said in a few incisive sentences by his great master. To his brother Joseph (Letter 174), Napoleon writes: "In war nothing is to be done but by

[8] "Six Months among the Charities of Europe." By John de Liefde. 2 vols. A. Strahan. 1865.

[9] "La Mère." Par Eugène Pelletan. Paris: Pagnerre. London: Williams and Norgate. 1865.

[10] "On Modern Armies." By Marshal Marmont. Duc de Raguse. Translated by Captain Lendy, F.G.S., F.L.S., &c. London: W. O. Mitchell. 1865.

calculation; whatever is not profoundly considered in its details produces no good result." Again, in Letter 215, "The art of war is to dispose your troops so that they may be everywhere at once: the art of distributing troops is the great art of war;" and in Letter 417, "To conquer is nothing—we must know how to profit by success." The second and third parts of the present volume are curious, as forming, perhaps, the last authoritative advocacy of Vauban's system and the Paixhan gun: the latter, we may inform our non-military readers, is a gun which discharges a large projectile at a slow velocity; and although, since the construction of iron-clads and rifled ordnance, this gun is no longer formidable, there seems something like prescience in the following observation, which, under changed circumstances, is eminently applicable to our present naval armaments: "But when we shall be able to mount on a small steam or sailing vessel of inconsiderable force, one or two pieces of artillery, one of whose projectiles suffices to destroy the largest ships, ten such small vessels, each armed with two large guns, would soon be able to dispose of any ship they may surround." The philosophy of war contains many very humane views on the treatment of the soldier. It may be possible in the French army, composed, owing to compulsory enlistment, of "respectable young men," to carry philanthropy to the exalted extent the marshal seems to think desirable; but for an army "mainly composed of vagabonds," which it appears is the result of the English system of voluntary recruiting, a "terrible discipline" is considered inevitable. The book, though marred by an indifferent translation, is interesting as coming from the pen of Marshal Marmont; but Captain Lendy must surely be conscious that what maxims it contains that are not obsolete, must read to the Sandhurst graduate of the present day very like military platitudes.

"Britain and her Colonies," by Mr. Hurlburt,[11] has but small claim to its comprehensive title. The book is little else than a Canadian's griefs against the mother country. Convenience, or direct advantage to the colonists, are relied on as a sufficient answer to any complaints made of their fiscal arrangements by England; but when it is urged that such complete self-government ought to imply self-defence also, refuge is immediately sought in the sentimental tie that has never yet been found to stand in the way of any colonial legislation. A common origin, the Anglo-Saxon race with its expectancies, the old home, and similar topics, are admirable things when they give warmth and colour to an identity of material interest, but offer a very feeble foundation for any political action where that identity is wanting. These colonial controversies are like bargains between friends, in which each party expects his own construction of the terms will be accepted by the other, and is so revolted at finding that he has to do with anything but the most self-sacrificing generosity, that a contrast between hostile pretenders appears in the upshot heartily to be preferred. Communities cannot negotiate on the basis of the fine feelings: when these are the natural result of their material relations, it is a state of things highly to be rejoiced in, but by no means to be depended on in any fresh set of circumstances. A colony which pleads its interests in excuse for its own policy, and appeals to the feelings of the mother country for further advantages, takes up the position of a spoilt child, and with an exactly corresponding success. It is, however, useless to add another page to those recriminations which fill Mr. Hurlburt's volume. There is but little gained by his review of a colonial policy which has been abandoned by England, and still less by his arguments drawn from the events and precedents of other colonies. The governmental relations of England with her colonies cannot present a greater uniformity than the circumstances of the multitudinous cases will admit of, and these are not susceptible of generalization to any practical purpose; the points in which they agree are utterly lost in the infinite variety of their differences. All the arguments which are suggested by the old toast, "ships, colonies, and commerce," and so much relied on by Mr. Hurlburt, are quite out of place after the triumph of the principles of Free Trade and the repeal of the Navigation Laws. Once, indeed, it used to be thought in England that colonies existed only for the benefit of the mother country; now it would appear to be an incontrovertible conclusion in the minds of colonists that the mother country exists only for their advantage. Thus the wheel of fortune brings about its revenges. The most useful part of Mr. Hurlburt's book is the account he gives of the proceedings taken towards consolidating the government of the British possessions in North America. A full report of the proposed constitution and of the negotiations connected with it will be found in the appendix. Whether this desirable arrangement be carried out or not, it cannot but have one good result in showing the Canadians that there are difficulties and conflicting interests nearer home which are not at once got rid of by magnificent declamation on the great future which awaits on the full development of the resources of the British North American Colonies.

In 1858 the late Sir Thomas Wyse, being called upon to act as president to the "Financial Commission to Inquire into the Resources of Greece," undertook a tour round the country for the purpose of personally investigating many of the questions which would come before it. The result of the labours of the commission was printed and laid before Parliament; but Sir Thomas found so many points of interest were touched upon in the notes he had taken, that he resolved to throw them into the form of a connected narrative of the excursion.[12] "Official business at first interfered

[11] "Britain and her Colonies." By J. B. Hurlburt, M.A., LL.D. London: E. Stanford. 1865.

[12] "An Excursion in Peloponnesus." By the

with his project, and at last the hand of death cut it short abruptly." The manuscript was bequeathed by him to his niece, who has loyally carried out his wishes by its publication. After calling at Epidaurus Limera, the tour may be said to commence at Gythium, from whence were visited the Laconian Valley, Messene, Phigaleia, Olympia, Psophis, Egium, and Corinth, thus completing the circuit of the country. The narrative is mainly concerned with the present state of the ancient remains at those places, and with a general description of the condition of the population. The ardent interest which Sir Thomas Wyse took in every question connected either with Greek art and civilization, or with the character and prospects of the modern peasantry, are manifest in every page. His account of the temple of Apollo Epicurus at Phigaleia is highly interesting, and the discussions connected with Olympia are treated by him with so much good sense and genuine feeling for art, that it is greatly to be regretted he had not the opportunity of giving a further development to this part of his work. In spite of the well-trodden character of the ground gone over, there are many things in these two handsome volumes that will cause their publication to be welcomed by all who are interested either in the history or prospects of the Greek Peninsula.

There is so little generally known in England on the condition of Russian art and literature, that perhaps even such a rambling and ill-digested book as Mr. Grahame's[12] on this subject may meet with readers which such an *olla podrida* could hardly expect on its own merits.

Mr. Hill's "Egypt and Syria"[14] is not so much a book of travel in the ordinary sense as an account of the reflections which occurred to him while passing through these countries. The complacent ease with which he delivers himself of the most ordinary remarks, and the rolling amplitude with which he builds up periods that come to nothing, would be in the last degree offensive were it not for a constantly present evidence of a natural amiability which disarms criticism. He makes no pretence to any peculiar information derived from his travels, and certainly affords none to any one who has read but a very few of the multitude of books which have been written on this subject. He evidently enjoyed his trip, but that he should have thought his account of it would have anything of the same effect on his readers, is but another feature of that amiable simplicity in his character which constantly checks the exclamations with which one is tempted to break out while reading his reflections. Like the Queen in "Hamlet," we exclaim with an involuntary impatience, "more matter and less art," and yet at the same time we cannot avoid entertaining a sort of respect for Polonius, in spite of his tediousness. The sententious platitudes of this volume make it a kind of literary curiosity, quite out of harmony with the moving spirit of the times in which it appears.

There are few Englishmen who do not entertain a high esteem for M. Esquiros. His accounts of our customs, manners, and institutions which from time to time appear in the pages of the "Revue des Deux Mondes" are animated by such a friendly and appreciative spirit that they cannot fail to exert the most beneficial influence on the minds of his compatriots, while the industry with which he gathers all the interesting facts connected with the special topic he has in hand makes his sketches almost as instructive to Englishmen as the tone in which he relates them is to their advantage. The last collection of these sketches is devoted to Cornwall and the south-western coast,[15] to our mining and fishing population in the west, to the description of the means of lighting our shores and headlands, and to a very complete account of our life-boat system and Trinity House supervision. M. Esquiros' taste for Nature, and his remarkable talent in bringing what has struck him as peculiar to English scenery before his readers, are already too well known to need remark, but form a peculiar attraction of the present volume, while his ethical appreciation of any characteristic anecdote, though it sometimes leads him to accept a story because it is good, gives a constant liveliness and human interest to his pages. Some very just remarks on the different results of centralization and self-help are made in a tone of grave irony that is in the last degree telling against a system which he has for a long time denounced in his native country. The volume is excellently translated, if it be not his own English, which we have once or twice, in reading it, supposed possible.

Mr. Boner's book on "Transylvania"[16] is not only an excellent description of the country and its resources, but what is still more rare, a full and trustworthy account of the strangely mixed population which inhabits it. Whether the reader be inclined or not to agree with the tone of his political remarks, he cannot but feel that they are the result of the most careful investigation, and few, we think, will lay down the volume without acknowledging the obligations they are under to its author. The personal characteristics of the Hungarian, Saxon, and Wallack races have never been so clearly laid before the English reader, nor, in spite of those predilections which are personal to the writer, so good an opportunity been afforded for arriving at an impartial judgment on the races in question. It may be said

late Right Hon. Sir Thomas Wyse, B.C.B. Edited by his niece, Miss W. M. Wyse. 2 vols. London: Day and Son (Limited). 1865.

[12] "The Progress of Science, Art, and Literature in Russia." By J. R. Grahame. London: Blackwood and Sons. 1865.

[14] "Travels in Egypt and Syria." By S. S. Hill, F.R.G.S. London: Longmans and Co. 1865.

[15] "Cornwall and its Coasts." By A. Esquiros, Author of "English at Home," &c. London: Chapman and Hall. 1865.

[16] "Transylvania: its Produce and its People." By C. Boner, Author of "Chamois Hunting in the Mountains of Bavaria," &c. London: Longmans and Co. 1865.

that the Hungarians constitute the nobility of the country, the Saxon immigrants, the burgher class, and the original inhabitants, the Wallacks (not Wallachians), the peasantry. A large number of gypsies and a few Jews make up the rest of the population. The Saxon or German element, which was introduced into the country in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and settled on its southern frontier, affords one of the most curious studies of social life in Europe. It is hardly possible to exaggerate the interest of the masterly picture which Mr. Boner draws of these communities. Forming, as for so many years they did, the bulwark of the country against the Turks, and exposed to constant inroads from beyond the mountains, their whole existence and mode of life were moulded by the dangers amid which they lived, while the franchises with which they were rewarded by the mediæval kings still further isolated them from the surrounding population. The singular fortified churches to which they retreated when forced to abandon the open country to the invaders are things entirely unlike anything else in Europe, and display, as it were, symbolically the history of a mode of life of which they were the key and culminating point. These village fortresses gave rise to the German name of the province Sieben-Burgen, or seven castles. The isolation, however, and the strict discipline to which these communities were forced to subject themselves, contained one element of weakness which is slowly undermining their strength. Their attachment to their little properties makes them so unwilling to divide the paternal acres, that it is a rare thing to find more than two children in a family among them, and their numbers are consequently gradually but certainly diminishing. Their old allegiance to the crown, of which they held their peculiar and valued privileges, rendered them something less than lukewarm partizans of the Hungarian revolution. This will never be forgotten nor forgiven by the Hungarians, a generous, impulsive, and passionate race, who, like many people possessing these fine qualities, are so intoxicated by their own emotions that they become absolutely incapable of doing justice to any views but their own. The consequent disunion between what may be called the upper classes of the country, joined to the resolute determination of the Hungarians to suffer all things rather than appear at a Parliament held at Vienna, exposes them to constant political defeats at the hands of the more numerous Wallack, or, as they prefer to call themselves, Rouman representatives. This part of the population, so long in a state of servitude, is now weighing, with all the force of overwhelming numbers, against the interests and wishes of their superiors and former masters. The conflict and cross purposes of these three parties are excellently described by Mr. Boner. The unquestionable difficulties of the political position drives him to wish that the Austrian Government had gone to work with a still higher hand than it actually did. This is a very natural feeling, but such Gordian knots are not to be untied with the sword. A full sense of, and an insight into these difficulties, is, however, an excellent preservative against overhasty denunciations of the course adopted by those on whom they press so heavily, and Mr. Boner will certainly succeed in one of the main purposes of his book, by showing that there has been much in the conduct of the Austrians which was praiseworthy and is forgotten, while their mistakes and rigours have been studiously dwelt upon and often exaggerated. The careful estimate he has formed of the political character and tendencies of the various nationalities of Transylvania is full of instruction and interest, and bears such unequivocal marks of sincerity that it demands the fullest attention. On the material resources and future wealth of the country, he is enthusiastically eloquent, and no project for developing or increasing either escapes his acute observation, or is left unaided by his ardent advocacy. There are very few recent books of the kind which approach its excellence. The author is full of his subject, and has the rare quality, which so few modern travellers possess, of recognising that it is the country they travel in, and not their personal adventures while there, which is of interest to any but themselves.

No one, it will be readily admitted, has better earned, or stands in greater need of a periodical holiday, than a working parson of a poor metropolitan parish. And nothing is more natural and appropriate than his giving some account of his relaxation in the form of lectures at the Mechanics' Institute or Working Men's College of his district. But a well-deserved success before such a public is perhaps but a feeble justification for addressing a larger one on such a well-worn subject as "A Month's Holiday in Switzerland."[17] Every corner of the country is now so fully explored, and all its natural beauties have been so well described, that there remains but little for such occasional travellers to delineate, except the effect produced upon themselves. This is not important information. The incidental portrait, however, which the Rev. Mr. Jones draws of himself has so many attractive features, he exhibits such thorough enjoyment of his holiday, and makes so much of every element of pleasure which he met with on the road, that, could he give his readers a receipt for securing a similar frame of mind, his book would then deserve to be very extensively read. It is true that the cheerfulness sometimes supports itself on very small jokes, and a great part of his enjoyment is associated with a rather commonplace style of moralizing improvement of way-side incidents, as may be seen in the following average extract:

"In the course of our walk we passed several very irritable echoes. These were provoked by men with huge cow-horns, from five to six feet long. They waited, with their instruments set in rude rests or

[17] "The Regular Swiss Round." In Three Trips. By the Rev. Harry Jones, M.A., Incumbent of St. Luke's, Berwick Street, Soho. London: A. Strahan. 1865.

crutches, at convenient spots, and when travellers came in sight, began to blow, holding out their hats for a fee as we passed. The few notes of this simple instrument are taken up and repeated so many times, but at such a distance, that the report of a single blast seems quite to have died away, before you hear a chorus of cow-horns begin, a mile off. We stopped and treated ourselves to several pennyworths of cow row. (This is Mr. Jones's favourite jocular translation of kuh reihen.) I should imagine that this unprofessional use of horns, which is used to call the cattle home, must cause confusion in the minds of the cows. I fear they are often at a loss to distinguish the summons of their own masters—the genuine voice of truth—from the selfish trumpetings of the gentlemen who, like many elsewhere, and much more pretentious, get their living simply by making a noise in the world."

"Ten years in South Central Polynesia," by the Rev. Thomas West,[18] gives a very full, clear, and intelligent account of the condition and prospects of the Friendly Isles. The author is an ardent admirer and partizan of King George of Tonga, who has been spoken of with very qualified respect by Dr. Seemann in his "Viti and the Vitians." It, however, cannot be called in question that the long personal acquaintance enjoyed by Mr. West entitles him to speak with an authority to which Dr. Seemann cannot lay claim. The grounds on which that admiration reposes are by no means concealed by Mr. West; a consistent support of the Wesleyan Mission to these islands, and an unfailing personal kindness to the missionaries, give him a fair claim to their favourable report. If he is ambitious, and the largely-extending circle of his influence is hardly consistent with any other supposition, he uses his growing power for the advantage of his subjects as well as his own. The politics of these remote islands of Central Polynesia, and the growing influence of the Tonguese among them, afford a very curious study, resembling in many respects the condition of things in the early periods of European history; on this account the present volume is worthy of the attentive perusal of many who would at first sight turn from it under the impression that it was a mere chronicle of missionary effort. Of course, in the author's mind this feature is the most interesting one; and he abounds in those peculiar forms of expression, and that ready reference of everyday events to the direct action of Divine Providence, which are so offensive to the taste of most educated people. He is, however, so well informed on his subject, and so ready to take a view more enlarged than that of the fortunes of the mission to which he was attached, that his account cannot be dispensed with by any one who wishes to study the first steps made by a savage people towards a more civilized mode of life. Such an opportunity is only offered by the writings of missionaries who have stayed among their flocks a sufficient time to become acquainted with their past history and general character; no other class of men, except in very unusual circumstances, can acquire the requisite knowledge, or qualify themselves for calm and dispassionate conclusions; and in spite of the lively interest which they naturally feel in the spread of that particular form of Christianity to which they are attached, and which consequently colours in a great measure the views they arrive at, they are still the most reliable sources for such insight as is attainable into the ethical condition of the savage races before their contact with Europeans. Mr. West's book is singularly rich in this respect; he has studied the Tonguese race and character with a loving interest that has enabled him to give an account of their life and country which will be attractive to a much larger circle than that which usually devotes its leisure to missionary histories. The volume would have appeared much earlier than it has done, but the author has been engaged since his return to Europe in 1855, in the laborious task of carrying out the translation of the Bible into the Tonguese language. On his voyage home, he called at the Viti Islands, and gives what may be called the Tonguese view of the proposed cession to the British Government. Though he does not expressly say so, there can be but little doubt he looks upon their government as naturally falling "in the fullness of time" to his friend and patron, King George of Tonga, and provisionally gives his hearty adherence to the policy of declining the cession in question. Altogether, the volume is highly valuable, and much superior to the generality of its class.

We have received a pamphlet, apparently printed for private circulation, by Mr. C. Poorooshottum, a native studying for the bar in England, on the Mysore, Nagpore, Sattara and Tanjore claim. It contains a short summary of the views held by the partizans of the native princes, and an appendix, in which is printed *in extenso* all the treaties concluded with each of them. We have so lately expressed our opinion on the principles involved in these controversies, that we shall not again revert to the subject, except to call attention to a reprint from the "Friend of India,"[19] which certainly ought to be read in connexion with the present pamphlet.

Dr. Rennie, the author of "Peking and the Pekingese,"[20] was, it appears, officially appointed by the Government of India to accompany the British Embassy to Peking in 1861. He was also, he tells us in his preface, selected by the members of the Legation to chronicle, with a view to publication, "the various incidents which were from day to day occurring during what may be termed the inaugural period of the foreign diplomatic residence at the capital." It might have been expected that under such auspices, and during a year's residence in a town and among a people as yet untouched by the tourist, an intelligent "man with a note-book" would have found ample materials both

[18] "Ten Years in South Central Polynesia." By the Rev. Thomas West. London: J. Nisbet and Co. 1865.

[19] "The proposed Mysore Crime." From "The Friend of India." Serampore Press. 1865.

[20] "Peking and the Pekingese during the First Year of the British Embassy at Peking." By D. F. Rennie, M.D., Staff Surgeon on special Service under the Government of India, Author of the "British Arms in North China and Japan." 2 vols. London: J. Murray. 1865.

instructive and amusing for filling two such thick volumes as those before us. It might have been expected, that with the advantage of being in daily communication with the members of the Legation, and in constant attendance at the diplomatic interviews with the celestial statesmen, the official chronicler would have given us some insight into the *modus operandi* of that "enlightened and conciliatory policy" which, in an inflated and fulsome dedication to Sir F. Bruce, he tells us has not only extinguished the Taeping rebellion, but has "been attended with results of the highest importance to the cause of humanity." Yet we look in vain throughout the book, which is written in the objectionable form of a diary, for any account of political action on the part of the Legation, whose chief business seems to have been, according to the Doctor, to superintend the building and decoration of a handsome Legation Court. On the other hand, we find pages of meagre and colourless description of buildings and scenery, written in slovenly and even ungrammatical English, interspersed with incidents of the most trivial character, often utterly irrelevant to anything Pekingese, and set down with a tedious exactness as to the hour and minute of their occurrence, and the state of the weather at the time. Equally valueless must we consider the author's opinions regarding the "psychological peculiarities, customs, and social life" of the Pekingese, for he forms them from the confidences of Chinese officials and teachers, from conversations with huxters (*sic*) and from occasional professional visits to native patients. Lying being an avowed and prominent constituent of Chinese politics, it would be almost amusing if it were not provoking to find a man, by no means a stranger to Oriental customs, implicitly accepting as truth the plausible euphemisms of courtiers and scholars who, under the jealous eye of a Government whose polity includes an espionage scarcely less rigorous than that of Japan, were not likely to to commit themselves beyond their instructions, doubtlessly very minutely defined. But perhaps the most disagreeable feature in the book is the declared bias with which the Chinese is compared with European character. Dr. Rennie never loses an occasion of disparaging the latter to exalt the former. The manner in which he makes his book a vehicle for trotting out his bias in the form of unreasonable and spiteful comments on all the doings of his fellow-countrymen, from the operations of the army in the field to the aberrations of a drunken private soldier, is in the worst taste, and especially unbecoming in the accredited mouthpiece of an English embassy. Wanting in spirit, humour, and almost every essential that makes a diary readable, those who are acquainted with Staunton's account of Lord Macartney's embassy, or the interesting travels of the Abbé Huc, and open this book in search of either amusement or novel information, will not fail to close it as we do with a feeling of weariness and disappointment.

"A Journey down the Valley of the Lahn,"[21] by Herr Müller, will be found useful by those who do not neglect the lovely side valleys of the Rhine, on their visits to that river. The little volume contains all those anecdotes and allusions to the celebrities connected with the different points on the route which make it a desirable companion on such a trip.

[21] "Eine Fahrt durch's Lahnthal." Von W. Müller, von Konigswinter. Wiesbaden: C. W. Kreidel. London: D. Nutt. 1866.

SCIENCE.

Dr. Brande's "Dictionary of Science,"[1] the publication of which has now reached its eighth part (out of twelve), bears such an array of good names upon its wrappers, that little doubt can be entertained as to the general quality of the work. And an inspection of the contents to a great extent confirms our anticipations: the terms explained are exceedingly numerous, and nearly all the more encyclopædiac articles upon subjects requiring more than a mere explanation, condensed into very small space. Nevertheless, differences are observable in the execution of the various departments of the work—the articles on Chemistry and Physics, Astronomy and Geology, striking us as decidedly the best. Of the articles and paragraphs on zoological and cognate subjects, some maintain rather too uncompromisingly the particular views of their author, whilst others, especially those relating to Insects, appear to have been derived from antiquated sources, and are often delusive or even erroneous. Still, considering the extent of ground covered by this dictionary, its marked defects must be confessed to be very few, and it will constitute a valuable work of reference for the general reader.

After the lapse of fourteen years the Actonian prize, of course doubled in value, has been awarded by the authorities of the Royal Institution to Mr. George Warington, for his Essay on the "Phenomena of Radiation,"[2] from a natural theological point of view; and no one who reads Mr. Warington's little work will be inclined to quarrel with this decision. In a remarkably clear and lucid manner our author has produced a most admirable popular representation of the complex correlation of "radiant force" with the most varied phenomena presented by the world around us, showing how intimately the action of the heat and light radiated by the sun are bound up with the production of climatic and other meteorological conditions, and with the very existence of vegetable and animal organization. The geological effects of radiation, which indeed are caused only by the long-continued prevalence of climatic phenomena, are also discussed, as are those views of radiation

[1] "A Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art. comprising the Definitions and Derivations of the Scientific Terms in General Use." &c. By W. T. Brande, D.C.L., F.R.S., and G. W. Cox, M.A. 8vo. London: Longmans. 1865.

[2] "The Phenomena of Radiation, as exemplifying the Wisdom and Beneficence of God." By George Warington, F.C.S. 12mo. London: Skeffington.

which the study of astronomy suggests. From the whole of these considerations, demonstrating, as they certainly do, a most perfectly adjusted mutual interdependence of very multifarious phenomena, our author endeavours to build up a theological argument, regarding them as furnishing an exemplification of the "wisdom and beneficence of God." All these adaptations, observable in the system of the Cosmos, are to be regarded, according to Mr. Warington, as means to an end, and as evidences of the eternal love of a personal Deity for the beings which he intended to create, of which man, of course, is the chief. This end assumed, the reasoning is sound; but it seems to us that, as with all other natural theologians, this assumption forms the weak point of Mr. Warington's argument, for philosophically we can only regard the universe, with all its component parts, organic and inorganic, as the necessary product of the action of force upon matter. The laws of force being what they are, the constitution of the world could hardly have been otherwise than it is; and thus, whatever wisdom we may recognise in the original plan, there is no room left for those displays of special beneficence in which the natural theologian seeks to find a confirmation even of his own particular form of belief.

No department of mineralogy is so generally attractive as that which treats of precious stones, and although perhaps knowledge of this kind is pursued rather out of curiosity than from any love of scientific studies, still the numerous interesting details which, as it were, crystallize around these objects of luxury, give them an interest as great, if not as intrinsic, as their value. The history of remarkable gems, and of the works of art executed upon them, their association with successive peoples who used them as ornaments, and, more especially, the remarkable superstitions which in many cases attached to them, lend these stones, which at first might be regarded as mere adornments of vanity, a significance which they would not otherwise possess, and no element of this has been lost sight of by Mr. King in the beautiful work on "The Natural History of Precious Stones and Gems,"[3] which he has lately published. In this the various stones are described under their ancient names, arranged not mineralogically but in alphabetical order; the ancient and mediæval history of each kind of stone is fully given; and the finest known works of art in each are described. Mr. King also includes gold and silver in the plan of his work, and then refers to coral and pearls, which as articles of ornament may perhaps be admissible, although hardly coming under any of the categories indicated in this title-page. An appendix contains a translation of a curious mystical poem on gems attributed to Orpheus, with articles on ancient jewellery, on the chemical constitution of precious stones, and some other matters connected with the subject. The illustrations consist of numerous tail-pieces admirably executed on wood, and representing some fine examples of ancient engraving and sculpture on gems.

Of all domestic miseries perhaps none are more capable of alleviation by the application of scientific principles than those which arise from bad fire-places and smoky chimneys, and to these Mr. Frederick Edwards has devoted his attention with considerable success. In his treatise on "Domestic Fire-places," of which a second edition has lately been published,[4] Mr. Edwards points out that by the systems of construction now in general use, an enormous waste of coal takes place in our common grates, the actual loss in London alone being estimated by him at fully 1,000,000*l.* annually; he considers further that "we deprive ourselves of comfort to the extent of 1,000,000*l.* sterling, in addition to this actual waste," whilst the presence of the vast quantity of smoke thus poured into the atmosphere is a further source of loss by deterioration of property. Thus, in order to fulfil the purpose of warming our rooms very imperfectly, we waste about twenty-five per cent. of our fuel, and by means of it continually vitiate the atmosphere. Boldly expressing the preference of a true-born Englishman for the open fire, Mr. Edwards sets himself to indicate the vices of the grates at present in use, and shows how, especially by adopting fire-clay backs in our fire-places, by abolishing the metal bars at the bottom of the grate, and by regulating the current of air up the chimney, we may easily and economically cause a great increase in the heat given off. Of Mr. Edwards's animadversions on the Patent Laws we need say nothing.

In his "Treatise on Smoky Chimneys,"[5] which appears to have originated from the work just noticed, Mr. Edwards enumerates no fewer than fifteen different causes for this very common source of discomfort, some of which would indeed be got rid of by the adoption of fire-places constructed as recommended by him, whilst others require special treatment. The course to be taken in each case is clearly indicated by the author, whose pamphlet should be attentively studied by all builders.

Mr. Mackay's "Outlines of Modern Geography,"[6] although modestly styled by him "A Book for Beginners," may also be regarded as a handy memorandum book of the leading facts of political geography for general use. It gives a general account of the chief surface features of the earth, and its various geographical divisions, in which, as in the author's larger educational works, the river-systems occupy a prominent place, and indicates

[3] "The Natural History, Ancient and Modern, of Precious Stones and Gems, and of the Precious Metals." By C. W. King, M.A. 8vo. London: Bell and Daldy. 1865.

[4] "Our Domestic Fire-places: a Treatise on the Economical Use of Fuel and the Prevention of Smoke. With Observations on the Patent Laws." By Frederick Edwards, Jun. Second Edition, 8vo. London: Hardwicke. 1865.

[5] "A Treatise on Smoky Chimneys: their Cure and Prevention." By Frederick Edwards, Jun. Third Edition. 8vo. London: Hardwicke. 1865.

[6] "Outlines of Modern Geography: a Book for Beginners." By the Rev. Alexander Mackay, A.M., F.R.G.S. 12mo. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood. 1865.

in a very condensed form the most important elements in the social and political condition of each country.

"Hardy Ferns," by Nona Bellairs,[7] will furnish beginners in the study of those beautiful and interesting plants with useful hints for the guidance of their first steps. It is the work of an enthusiastic lover of Ferns, who records not only her successes but also her failures and disappointments, for the instruction and warning of her readers. She describes her endeavours to procure the rarer British species, her expeditions with bag and trowel, and the scenery into which these excursions led her, indicates the principal distinctions of most of the species, and especially gives a good account of her experience of Fern-growing.

Of the numerous popular works on Zoology which have been produced of late years, one of the best is certainly that published by Mackenzie, under the title of the "Museum of Natural History."[8] Its object is less to teach the science of zoology than to give a general sketch of the forms and habits of animals, but the authors of all the sections have apparently perceived the importance of communicating at the same time at least some portion of systematic knowledge, and for this purpose the classification throughout (except among the lowest forms) is carried as far as the families, and in some cases attention is even directed to subordinate groups. As usual, however, in works of this nature, by far the greater amount of space is devoted to the higher groups of animals, the Mammalia and Birds occupy one half of the work, and are pretty fully illustrated by reference to species, another quarter is taken up by the descriptions of Reptiles and Fishes, the latter, however, being rather compressed, whilst the account of the whole vast series of Invertebrata is condensed into the fourth and last section, where it occupies rather more than two hundred pages. The Radiata and Protozoa, of course, have more especially suffered by this extreme compression, and some of the most interesting phenomena in the life-history of the former, such as the alternation of generations in the Hydrozoa (the natural relations of which are by no means represented in the classification adopted) and the singular modes of development of the Echinodermata are passed over in silence. We may add that this work is copiously illustrated both with plates and woodcuts, which are generally very well executed, and many of the former are coloured.

Of Cassell's "Popular Natural History,"[9] the second volume of which, including descriptions of the lower half of the Mammalia, is now before us, we cannot speak quite so highly. Its author has abstained from attempting to give his work any prominent scientific features, and in adopting this course he has certainly shown considerable judgment, for in the few places where he ventures upon anything of the kind, he displays a marked ignorance of Zoology. This work, indeed, is to be regarded merely as a collection of anecdotes of animals brought together without much discrimination, and by no means particularly well arranged; most of the illustrations, however, which are chiefly woodcuts by French artists, are very good. Some notion of the author's qualifications for his task may be gained from the fact that, having omitted all notice of the Seals from their proper place, under the Carnivora, he introduces them after the *Ornithorhynchus*, and as if members of the Marsupial group of Mammals.

The zoological portion of Mr. Cholmondeley Pennell's "Book of the Pike"[10] is almost a verbatim reprint of his article on that fish in his "Angler Naturalist," the principal alterations consisting in its division into chapters and some little transposition of certain paragraphs. The additions are very trifling. But this section occupies comparatively but a small portion of the book, which is mainly devoted to the discussion of the various devices adopted by the angler for the capture of this tyrant of our rivers and lakes. An enthusiastic pike-fisher, Mr. Pennell has bestowed no inconsiderable amount of thought upon the best construction of spinning tackle, and the results of his researches upon this, which he regards as the most successful means of taking pike, are here clearly described and well illustrated by woodcuts. The author's devotion to spinning does not, however, shut his eyes to the advantages possessed by other methods of fishing, which he describes in detail, suggesting here and there certain improvements, especially in the well-known spoon bait, for some of which we think trollers will be thankful.

A Scotch Rural D.D. has given us a small volume of "Contributions to Natural History,"[11] consisting apparently of reprints of articles from the "Quarterly Journal of Agriculture," in which several subjects connected with the increase of our supplies of food are treated in a popular and amusing style. The articles embrace a discussion of the value of horse-flesh as food, for which aliment the D.D. appears really to have some liking—a plea for the increased use of fungi as articles of diet—a good account of the piscicultural efforts now being made for the purpose of re-stocking our depopulated rivers—and a description of the

[7] "Hardy Ferns: How I Collected and Cultivated them." By Nona Bellairs. 12mo. London: Smith, Elder and Co. 1865.

[8] "The Museum of Natural History: being a Popular Account of the Structure, Habits, and Classification of the various departments of the Animal Kingdom." By Sir John Richardson, C.B., F.R.S.; W. S. Dallas, F.L.S.; T. Spencer Cobbold, M.D., F.L.S.; William Baird, M.D., F.L.S.; and Adam White. 4 vols. 8vo. London and Edinburgh: Mackenzie.

[9] "Cassell's Popular Natural History." Illustrated with about two thousand engravings. Vol. II. 8vo. London and New York: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin.

[10] "The Book of the Pike: a Practical Treatise on the Various Methods of Jack Fishing." By H. Cholmondeley Pennell. 12mo. London: Hardwicke. 1865.

[11] "Contributions to Natural History, chiefly in Relation to the Food of the People." By a Rural D.D. 12mo. London and Edinburgh: Blackwood. 1865.

processes of culture adopted for the propagation of oysters and mussels, the former for human food, the latter chiefly for use as bait by the sea-fishermen. Besides these we have a paper on the herring and another on the effects of fish-diet on the human constitution, in which, from the experience derived from the curious fishing community of Commachio (described in a separate article), the author shows that there is no foundation for the supposed anti-Malthusian results of the exclusive use of such aliment. The author has also an article on Acclimatization Societies, and on the Horse of the African Deserts, the latter with no reference to its esculent qualities, whilst in other papers he departs still more widely from his gustatory starting-point, and treats of the cultivation of pearls and leeches. Little of the information contained in these short treatises will possess much novelty in the eyes of scientific men, but they are admirably adapted for the information of the public at large upon several matters, the importance of which will probably increase upon us daily.

In the second edition of his "Prehistoric Man" Dr Wilson[12] has taken the opportunity not only of introducing such recent results of anthropological study as seem to bear upon his theories, but also of applying the pruning-knife pretty freely, removing a good many redundancies of expression, and thus most decidedly improving his book. He has also adopted a new division of his subject into chapters, which seems in some respects to be an improvement on the former one; and by an alteration in the typographical execution the work is brought within the compass of a single volume. We cannot, however, detect any change in the general arguments put forward by the author, or in the main results to which they lead him. (See *Westminster Review*, vol. xxiv. p. 266.) The arguments with regard to the origin of the Native American population still stand as in the first edition; and Dr. Wilson strenuously maintains the common origin of all mankind, applying, indeed, in its support, the occurrence of an extremely long series of varieties in the domestic pigeon, adduced by Darwin as the starting-point of his theory of natural selection.

Mr. Lang has published a lecture, delivered by him at Melbourne, on "The Aborigines of Australia,"[13] which, although directed more especially to the indication of the means by which the relations of the natives to the white settlers may be placed on a satisfactory footing, contains a great amount of curious information upon the habits and customs of the Australian blacks.

In a pamphlet on "The Distribution of Nerves to Voluntary Muscle," and in the Croonian lecture for 1865, Dr. Lionel Beale[14] maintains, in opposition to views very generally received, that the nerves of the muscles are nowhere continuous with the contractile tissue in any way; and, indeed, that the ultimate nerve-fibres do not, strictly speaking, *terminate*, but return into themselves, forming a sort of network, through which the current of nerve-force passes quite exterior to the muscular fibres which they influence.

In a little book, on what he calls "Finger Gymnastics," Mr. Edwin Jackson[15] has called attention to an important department of physical education, which has certainly been too much neglected. He holds that the efficiency of the hands for a great variety of purposes may be greatly increased by the constant practice of various evolutions, tending especially to give flexibility and independence of movement to the fingers. The exercises recommended by him seem to be well adapted to the production of the desired end.

All the most characteristic opinions, ancient and modern, superstitious and scientific, concerning dreams, and many of the most striking instances and stories of dreams on record, have been brought together by Mr. Seafield within the compass of two volumes.[16] He has spared no pains, and shirked no research, in order to render his account complete; and the consequence is that he has produced a work which will be interesting to those who read from simple curiosity, and useful and instructive to those who study with scientific aim. One thing soon strikes the reader of such a work, and that is, how much succeeding writers repeat one another, and how very little new matter or thought is added; theories, anecdotes, and quotations appear again and again, and the sum of real knowledge might be comprised within a small compass. Mr. Seafield's aim has been, however, to allow the different writers to speak for themselves in their own words; and he has modestly forborne any commentary upon, or discussion of, the opinions which he quotes. His work as author, is, in fact, limited to a few chapters, in which he discusses such questions as the place of dreams in a system of divination, biblical dreams, the causes, uses, and phenomena of dreams, and the modes of dream-interpretation, ancient and modern. The style which he

[12] "Prehistoric Man: Researches into the Origin of Civilization in the Old and the New World." By Daniel Wilson, LL.D. Second Edition. 8vo. London: Macmillan. 1865.

[13] "The Aborigines of Australia." By Gideon S. Lang. 8vo. Melbourne: Wilson and Mackinnon. 1865.

[14] "The Distribution of Nerves to Voluntary Muscle." By Lionel S. Beale, M.B., F.R.S. 8vo. London: Churchill and Sons. 1865. "On the Ultimate Nerve Fibres Distributed to Muscle and some other Tissues:" being the Croonian Lecture for 1865, delivered by Lionel S. Beale, M.B., F.R.S. Reprinted from the Proceedings of the Royal Society.

[15] "Jackson's Gymnastics for the Fingers and Wrist." 12mo. London: Trübner. 1865.

[16] "The Literature and Curiosities of Dreams: a Commonplace Book of Speculations concerning the Mystery of Dreams and Visions, Records of Curious and well-authenticated Dreams, and Notes of the Various Modes of Interpretation adopted in Ancient and Modern Times." By Frank Seafield, M.A. Chapman and Hall. 1865.

adopts would certainly be improved by a great deal of pruning, for it sometimes reaches a bombastic inflation, and is not unfrequently disfigured by extravagant expressions that are not in good taste, and by forced witticisms that now and then border on vulgarity. Why should Mr. Seafield, or any other writer, not driven to earn his bread by the line, talk of "public perpendicular suffocation," when he means to speak of hanging? Some of the selections are from obscure writers who have not added anything to knowledge, while valuable contributions have been omitted, as was perhaps unavoidable; though Mr. Seafield quotes Jean Paul's "Dream of the Universe," he has overlooked the admirable philosophical observations on dreaming by that writer in his "*Vorschule der Aesthetik*." Lastly, it is not easy to understand the logic of the author when he maintains that dreams "show that mental action is not dependent on physical organisms, and thus help to establish an important analogical argument for the immortality of the soul."

If, as Dr. Johnson has said, it is the excellence of a writer to put in his book so much as his book will hold, then unquestionably Dr. Copland has reached a high level of excellence in this abridged edition of his great "Dictionary of Practical Medicine."[17] A faithful abridgment is a difficult task enough in any case, and most difficult to the author; but in the case of a work so laboriously systematic in its method, so pregnant with theory, and so crammed with information, as was the first edition of his dictionary, we almost wonder that the tenacious energy and persevering industry of Dr. Copland did not falter. There is a special interest attaching to a work like this, which, though condensed into a summary, is yet a development; those who write on medicine at the present day write entirely from a modern stand-point, but Dr. Copland having written thirty years ago, and now revising his work by the light of the latest scientific acquisitions, displays the passage from the old to the new, and, indicating the position successively taken and abandoned, traces for us the march of progress. It is indeed a high tribute to the first edition that its author can venture to maintain now that subjects, then little known, were treated by him in a way which the progress of science has since completely justified: he claims to have anticipated by a scientific prevision some of the most important doctrines established of late years, as, for example, the modern opinions with regard to the varieties of fever, the latest theory concerning the coagulation of the blood, and, above all, the great doctrine of reflex action, both in its physiological aspect as "reflex sympathy," and in its pathological aspect as "reflex disorder." We have looked carefully through the vast mass of instruction contained in this somewhat bulky abridgment; and although, as may well be supposed, there are some deficiencies detectable, yet the wonder on the whole is that they are so few. Amongst subjects in which recent progress has been so marked, and which receive due consideration from Dr. Copland, are embolism of the cerebral arteries as a case of softening; Amaurosis, and its ophthalmoscopic signs; Amyloid Degeneration, as made known by the researches of Virchow and Wilk especially; the latest observations on Cancer; and the modern theory of Inflammation. Among diseases, the knowledge of which has of late received great development, but for an adequate description of which we have looked in vain in this dictionary, are Leucocythæmia, Chronic Alcoholism, Progressive Muscular Atrophy or Wasting Palsy, and Locomotor Ataxy or true Tabes Dorsalis. The account of General Paralysis, too—a distinct disease, if there is any distinct disease—is vague and defective; and we doubt whether many will be found to agree with Dr. Copland, that it is not conclusively established that the *Acarus* is the invariable cause of Scabies. Occasionally it appears to us that an elaborate article is given to what would more properly find its place in the description of the symptoms of a particular disease, whereby some vagueness is incurred, and some repetition entailed. In fact, an ungracious critic might sometimes ask for more matter with less art, more real organic method with less appearance of formal method. We, however, cannot but admire the industry which has compiled within reasonable compass such a quantity of instructive matter; and take leave only to rebel against a formidable appendix of more than five hundred formulæ, which in this age is simply an anachronism.

A great part of the physician's duty is "to stand sentry against the fatal productions of poly-pharmacy," asserts Dr. Chambers in his Lectures.[18] Two important principles are by him inculcated with great force, both of them well worthy to be had in constant remembrance: the first, that disease is the result, not of any excess of vital action, but of deficient life; and the second, that disease is not a morbid entity, which must be expelled like a lurking enemy, but that it is life under other than typical conditions. An "excess of vital action" he holds to be a contradiction in terms, as there cannot be too active a metamorphosis of the tissues into their *complete* form:—

"The most active metamorphosis of the body possible, the highest possible development of life in every part, is HEALTH. The complete cessation of metamorphosis is DEATH. The partial cessation, or the exhibition of materials in an incomplete form, however copious they may be, is DISEASE. In death, the flesh goes on being decomposed, as during life; but not being renewed the form is lost entirely. In disease, decomposition goes on, but renewal flags: the incomplete tissues are retained as part of the

[17] "A Dictionary of Practical Medicine, comprising Special Pathology, the Principles of Therapeutics, the Nature and Treatment of Diseases, Morbid Structures, and the Diseases especially incidental to Climates, to Races, to Sex, and to the Epochs of Life. The whole forming a Digest of Pathology and Therapeutics. By James Copland, M.D., F.R.S., &c. Abridged by the author, assisted by James C. Copland, M.R.C.S. Longmans, Green and Co. 1866.

[18] "Lectures, chiefly Clinical." By Thomas King Chambers, M.D., &c. Fourth Edition. Churchill and Sons. 1865.

imperfect body—a sort of 'death in life'—and are rightly termed by the pathologist 'degenerate.' They are generated, but not *re*-generated; they are generated in an inferior mould or form."

In accordance with these principles Dr. Chambers systematises the common-sense maxims of treatment, and applies them to the different diseases of which he treats in these lectures. He appears to be one of those few men who can reconcile themselves to profit by reproof; for in this fourth edition he has, in deference to the opinions of critics, sacrificed the original title of his book, "The Renewal of Life," and has weeded it of certain extravagances of language and expression. Though there yet remain some "expressions of questionable taste," and of more questionable philosophy, the solid merits and practical sense of the lectures fully explain the success which the issue of a fourth edition proves them to have had, and to have deserved.*

In three lectures, originally delivered before the College of Physicians, and now published in one volume, Dr. Peacock considers certain causes of disease of the heart that have not hitherto been sufficiently recognised, and points out their evil effects.[19] In the first lecture he gives a detailed account of various cases of disease of the heart, originating in malformation of its valves, and describes the forms of their defective development, and the mode in which this operates injuriously. He has observed that in as many as 25·5 per cent. of cases of valvular disease there was such malformation, and that the resultant heart disease by no means necessarily declared itself in early life. The second lecture is occupied with an account of diseases originating in injuries of the heart and in alterations in the capacity of its orifices and cavities. The last lecture contains the results of Dr. Peacock's careful observations of the weight of the healthy heart in males and females, and of the changes which occur in it in different forms of valvular or other disease. In adult males, who have died from acute disease or accident, the ordinary weight of the heart is from 9 to 11 oz.; and in those who have died from chronic disease, from 8 to 10 oz. In females the corresponding weights are 8 to 10 oz. and 7 to 9 oz. Where there is general hypertrophy of the heart, the weight may range from the healthy standard to 40 oz. 12 drms.; this last being the weight of the heaviest heart which Dr. Peacock has met with. His observations have evidently been made with great care and industry, and his modest work constitutes a really valuable contribution to medical science.

Mr. Hunter[20] has embodied in a pamphlet his contributions to medical journals concerning the value of the method of injecting certain medicines under the skin—the so-called hypodermic method of using them. There can be no doubt that this is sometimes a valuable expedient to have recourse to, and that its use will be very much extended in time to come; but whether Mr. Hunter's somewhat indiscriminating advocacy will not ultimately do mischief to the cause which he has at heart is not so certain. We should be sorry to guarantee the entire correctness of his physiological pathology, or to act implicitly upon the maxims which he enthusiastically enforces. If there is one sober truth which an extensive experience teaches, it is that opium will not quench the fury of acute idiophatic mania, though it will sometimes quench the patient's life; and yet, if we understand Mr. Hunter correctly, he holds that the injection of morphia will act miraculously, and in a wonderful way restore the sufferer to his right mind. Those, however, who have witnessed the brief snatches of fitful sleep that sometimes follow successive injections of morphia in acute mania, and the final fatal collapse, will be disposed to have less certain faith than Mr. Hunter appears to have, and to exercise considerable caution.

To read the character of any one with certainty from the expression of his features would undoubtedly be of great service in social intercourse. It is the result of many years' research into this obscure language that Mr. Stothard now presents to the public, in the hope that it will be found useful in assisting those who have patronage to fill up appointments properly, and those who are about to get married to make proper selections.[21] Mr. Stothard conceives that Noah must have possessed physical power and mental energy of the highest order; for, as he plausibly observes, "to construct a building sufficiently large to hold male and female of all animals, in addition to his own family, his three sons and their wives, was an undertaking which exceeded all the labours of Hercules." Shem, Ham, and Japhet, however, whose heads, together with the head of their father, Mr. Stothard figures in outline, possessed only physical strength, and were deficient in nervous and mental power ("a fact which would be evidenced by the stubborn, harsh, and uncomplying quality of the hair"); and so it came to pass that their posterity exhibit all sorts of deficiencies. The different varieties of eyes, ears, lips, and noses are delineated, and the interpretation of them given; and there is also a table, called "The Anthropological Catholicon; or, Alpha and Omega of Man: being an Announcement of the various Powers of the Human Being from Birth to Death, as a Guide for the Scholastic Training of Man, wherever Existing on the Earth." We are sorry to have to add that we have been very greatly shocked in the course of our studies; for on comparing the features of Christ, as delineated by Mr. Stoth-

[19] "On some of the Causes and Effects of Valvular Disease of the Heart: being the Croonian Lectures of the Royal College of Physicians for 1865." By Thomas B. Peacock, M.D., &c. Churchill and Sons, New Burlington-street.

[20] "On the Speedy Relief of Pain and other Nervous Affections by means of the Hypodermic Method." By Charles Hunter. Churchill and Sons. 1865.

[21] "Psychoneurology: a Treatise on the Mental Faculties, as Governed and Developed by the Animal Nature; shown by a Demonstrative Chart, entitled 'Anthropological Catholicon.'" By Robert Thomas Stothard. Francis Harvey. 1865.

ard, with his previous description and interpretation of individual features, we have been horrified to find that the nose is penurious and covetous, the eye selfish, and that the lips, if anything, are those of one insensible and invetcrate when offended.

Mr. Heather Bigg has brought together into one book what he has written at different times concerning the mechanical appliances suitable for the treatment of the different deformities of the human body.[22] During late years the art of mechanical therapeutics has been greatly improved, especially in America, under the stimulating influence of the recent great war; and so ingeniously have many of the instruments been made, and so effectual are they for their purposes, that Mr. Bigg confidently hopes "that ultimately deformity will become comparatively rare in civilized communities." Hitherto there has not been any trustworthy guide to the mechanical aids necessary for the prevention and treatment of deformities; and it is this want which the author of the work before us has aimed to supply. He appears to have accomplished his design with considerable success.

This seems to be the age of medical pamphleteering. A popular lecture given, or a paper published in a journal, supplies the occasion of an appearance before the public in a separate form, either in the hope that the publication "may be of service in the cause of truth against error," or "that it may be instructive to the profession and beneficial to the welfare of the public." Dr. Ellis[23] wishes for the first, and Dr. Galloway[24] hopes for the second result; and we may benevolently join them in their hopes and wishes without much expectation that the insensible public will ever be duly aware of what they have done for its good.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

We place at the head of our quarterly survey of historical works the "Manetho" of Dr. A. H. von Sargans, a treatise which carries us into the very depths of hoar antiquity.[1] Von Sargans, who has given a good deal of attention to the subject, lays great stress on the value of a chronology as a limiting and determining power. He accepts and restores Manetho; differs from Bunsen, more or less; and disagrees, we can scarcely say how far, with Lepsius. His book is ingenious, and testifies to his research and labour. We dare not say that it is convincing, but we can recommend it to fossil-loving historians, as embodying a view that deserves consideration. The oldest mythical traces therein take us back to the first peopling of Europe, to the islands of the Blessed to Tartarus (Tartessus), and Hades or Gades. Then we come to the earliest emigrations, to Asia, India, and Egypt; and on opening the first book of "Manetho," to Moses and the pyramids. With the second (no less than with the first) book we come into direct contact with the Biblical narrative, which Von Sargans is disposed to treat as tenderly as he can, but about which he discourses in somewhat cloudy language. As far as we can understand him, he regards the Mosaic annals as supplying valuable chronological *data*, but not as containing a purely historical groundwork. Rather, the patriarchal story is, he thinks, an adaptation of that of Syria and Damascus. The first ten patriarchs are identified by him with the ten Babylonian Kings of Berosus. Adam himself is Manes, equivalent to Ar, (man), whose origin may be referred to Armenia. The author seems unable to decide whether Musæus, with his mysteries, his Jao, his Sabazius, Iacchus, his golden apple-tree on Mount Ida, guarded by the Dragon and the Maiden, is a reflex of a purer Eastern theology, or whether Moses, with his Jehovah Sabaoth, is the Jewish equivalent of a Chaldean prototype; yet he is confident that the Exodus took place in the year 1491 B.C. We have said enough of his book to show what the inquisitive reader will find it. It *may* suggest truth or correct error, where it does not directly instruct or convince; but we fear that the chronological parallels are not always satisfactorily made out.

Mr. Churchill Babington's "Introductory Lecture on Archæology," delivered before the University of Cambridge, starts with a definition of the subject and a specification of the principal kinds of archæalogical monuments.[2] The remains of antiquity among the Egyptians, Assyrians, Persians, Jews, Phœnicians, Greeks, and Romans are rapidly noticed. Those of the Byzantine Empire and mediæval Europe are next surveyed; and the essay concludes with a list of the qualifications necessary for an archæologist, and an estimate of the pleasures and advantages which result from the corresponding study. The author illustrates the value of natural history, by showing that it settles the dispute of the numismatists, whether the flower which occurs on the reverse of the beautiful Greek coins of Rhodes is that of the rose or pomegranate. The divided calyx at once, he asserts, proves that the representation is intended for the rose, from which flower the island derives its name. So does knowledge answer to knowledge, and science complete science.

---

[22] "Orthopraxy: the Mechanical Treatment of Deformities, Debilities, and Deficiencies of the Human Frame." By H. Heather Bigg. Churchill and Sons. 1865.

[23] "The Progress of Medical Science." By Edward Ellis, M.D., &c.

[24] "On Reflex Paralysis." By William Galloway, A.M., Ph.D. Churchill and Sons. 1865.

[1] "Manethos, die Origenes unserer Geschichte und Chronologie." Von Dr. Anton Henne von Sargans, gewesenem Professor der Geschichte an der St. Galler Kantons und der Berner Hochschule, u.s.w. Mit einer synoptischen Tafel der alten Chronologie. Gotha: Perthes. 1865.

[2] "The Introductory Lecture on Archæology, delivered before the University of Cambridge." By Churchill Babington, B.D., F.L.S., Disney Professor of Archæology, &c., Cambridge. Deighton, Bell and Co. 1865.

Mr. Reynolds is quite right in announcing that his sketch of the "System of Modern History" does not contain the results of any original research.[3] The first part only of this sketch is in our hands. For the description of the four centuries of which it treats he has consulted Hallam, Gibbon, Milman, and Amédée Thierry's "Tableau de l'Empire Romaine." By the help of these valuable allies he conducts us through the dark centuries, beginning with the invasions of the barbarians, and ending with Charlemange, his wars, and his government. Mr. Reynolds appears to us to have read to good purpose the historical disquisitions of M. Comte with whose view of the origin of the Feudal System, Mr. Maine, also (quoted by our author) is in general harmony. "It need only be remarked," says Mr. Reynolds, "that it was an organised plan at once of defensive warfare and internal government which arose spontaneously in the absence of any central temporal power, as soon as the barbarians settled down in their new country, became conscious of the necessity of defending themselves against further inroads similar to their own." And he continues:— "The feudal system was no afterthought, as it were, of the barbarians who dismembered the empire, but came necessarily into being under a state of circumstances which were essentially the same as they would have been if no one of the Northern swarms had succeeded in establishing itself among the nations of the South." This is but an expression of the doctrine of Comte, though ostensibly derived from the pages of Maine. The essay in which this view of the origin of feudalism is put forth, if not original, is useful reading enough, and well suited to the wants of the times in which men almost literally run as they read.

The antediluvian opinions expressed by Mr. Gladstone, in his eloquent address delivered before the University of Edinburgh, would have justified us in noticing the pamphlet in which it is contained, in closer connexion with the archæological essay already described.[4] The distinguished author really believes that the religions of the world have some sort of relation to that divine truth which was imparted to the Hebrews long before the days of Moses! He really thinks that the humanistic element of primitive tradition was embodied in the few but pregnant words that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head! and that a link associating the early Greek mythology with this humanistic element is supplied by the character of Apollo! Mr. Gladstone is not even correct in his archæology, when he says that the stringent prohibitions of the second commandment of the Decalogue appear to have been specially pointed against the execution by human hands of the figure of a man, since that commandment expressly forbids the idolatrous imitation of *any likeness* in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. To comment on the address throughout, however, is an enterprise that we cannot undertake. It is pleasanter to commend the broad and liberal spirit of human sympathy which it displays, and to point to the proximately philosophical declaration that the Greeks have their place in the Providential order of the world, and in the Evangelical Preparation, as truly and really as the children of Abraham themselves.

Were it not for these and similar judicious words, Mr. Gladstone's Address would be appropriately coupled with "Sketches of General History," by the late James Douglas of Cavers, who begins his book with the pleasing information that the events and monuments of a former world, except the few fragments related in Genesis, perished in the Flood.[5] The sketches are about a dozen in number; they were written more than thirty years ago, and some of them delivered in a country village, where, let us hope, they found a fit audience, though few. The book is suited to those who hold, with the author, that History and Prophecy were at first united, but, when God separated Abraham to himself, Prophecy no longer embraced, &c.

In the Genealogical Calendar of Mr. Charles Roberts we are happy to find that there is no pedigree that goes back to the time of the Flood, by a long way. His miscellaneous collection of so-called Inquisitions *post mortem*, is described by the laborious author as to a certain extent, and with variations of date and circumstance, both a Chancery and an Exchequer series of these documents.[6] The value of these Inquisitions was known as long ago as 1800, and somewhere about thirty years after that date the Record Commissioners published a Calendar with a total omission of the genealogical information, and having other secondary but serious defects. These errors Mr. Roberts has endeavoured to avoid. He has, he assures us, quoted the exact words from the Record in the extracts contained in his numerous pages, giving them, not in their original abbreviated form, but at full, so that they may be readily intelligible. The two volumes containing these documents relative to the succession of heirs, include the two reigns of Henry III. and Edward I.

In the "Descriptive Catalogue of Materials relating to the History of Great Britain and Ireland, to the End of the Reign of Henry VII.," we have another instalment of the Record Office series. Mr. G. Duffus Hardy prefixes to this valuable catalogue a well-written

[3] "System of Modern History. Part I. Rise of the Modern European System." By S. H. Reynolds, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Brasenose College. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black. 1865.

[4] "Address on the Place of Ancient Greece in the Providential Order of the World: delivered before the University of Edinburgh, on the 3rd of November, 1865." By the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Foreign Associate of the Institute of France. London: Murray. 1865.

[5] "Sketches of Early History." By the late James Douglas of Cavers.

[6] "Calendarium Genealogicum. Henry III. and Edward I." In two volumes. Edited by Charles Roberts, Secretary of the Public Record Office. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1865.

and attractive preface.[7] The first part of this preface refers to the peculiarities of Saxons and Normans, and, with a little qualification, the estimates seem to us correct enough. He sums up: "The qualities of one race passed into the other; the Norman learned to respect and imitate those qualities of the Anglo-Saxon which imparted greater breadth, greater depth, profounder thought and feeling, to his own character; and the Anglo-Saxon received in his turn from the Norman a sense of order, of organization, of brotherhood in Christendom, he had not possessed before." In the second part of his preface Mr. Hardy sets before his readers a brief notice of the main authorities for the History of England from the Norman Conquest to the close of the 13th century.

Revenons à nos moutons. With the Rev. Samuel Lysons we return to the Flood. This antediluvian gentleman is of opinion that the deluge of Genesis fully accounts for various geological phenomena, and upsets the theorists who want to push back creation, since they cannot push her forward, with a story of an old woman who persisted in never being more than fifty years of age, till her son attained the half century, when, as mother and son could not both be of the same age, he proposed to go back a bit, unless his stationary parent would consent to go forward. In citing the authority of C. J. Solinus, Mr. Lysons does not intimate any doubt as to the age in which he wrote, but boldly places him in the year A.D. 80. Bocchus, indeed, from whom Solinus possibly borrowed a part of his material, lived in the reign of Claudius, but Solinus himself did not long precede that of Arcadius, and is first quoted by Augustin about A.D. 426. In endeavouring to answer the question who and what were our British ancestors,[8] Mr. Lysons displays a good deal of curious ingenuity, adducing various resemblances, especially in language, to show that the story of Nennius, who gives the first peopling of this country to Brutus, is not an invention of his own, but that early rovers, about the time of the siege of Troy, may have been our first colonists. He maintains that the same language and religion prevailed both in Britain and Assyria, and is very indignant with those sceptical inquirers who threaten to take all the plums out of his historical pudding, leaving him without his Phœnician visits to the Cassiterides, and even depriving him of the more modern and truly religious luxury of Gunpowder Treason and Plot. It is only fair to say that Mr. Lysons is a man of considerable reading, though of feeble intellectual digestion.

It is a relief to pass from the historical chaos which no sunlight illuminates, to the comparative *terra firma* of the ancient Eastern World, which Mr. George Rawlinson treads with a dexterous and often steady, if sometimes adventurous foot, lighted by the torch of an ingenious erudition where the lustre of direct evidence pales or expires. The third volume of "The Five Great Monarchies" shows considerable research, and an extensive acquaintance with the subjects treated.[9] If there is here and there a passage which indicates a predisposition on the author's part to believe the most he can, it may serve to correct the opposite tendency, on the part of men like the late Sir G. C. Lewis, to believe the least they can. Mr. Rawlinson may be right in his high estimate of Babylonian civilisation, but we confess to an a priori distrust of his Chaldæan clients, and cannot consent to accredit those genethliological Galileos with the invention of the telescope, which he is half-inclined to attribute to them, though he does not actually do so. There is not much to object to in Mr. Rawlinson's use of Biblical documents. In affirming the true derivation of Babel to be Bab Il, the gate of the god Il, he tacitly admits that the Hebrew etymology is mythical, which is candid. He is not always, however, equally satisfactory; as when, in referring to the siege of Tyre, he explains away the words of Ezekiel which imply that Nebuchadnezzar did *not* take Tyre; or when he coolly assumes that the Greek names of musical instruments, which occur in the Book of Daniel, prove the existence of an early international intercourse, whereas, taken in conjunction with numerous other critical data, they afford a strong presumption of the late origin of that religious romance. In fact, Mr. Rawlinson's whole treatment of this book is disappointing. He appeals to it as history, and (though not without an approach to rationalism) accepts the story of the Babylonian king as authentic, humorously observing that the malady of Nebuchadnezzar consisted in the belief that one is not a man but a beast, and sometimes in the loss of the erect posture, and a preference for walking on all-fours. We are glad to think that Mr. Rawlinson manages to preserve his erect posture, and that he seldom shows any preference for the adoption of the natural and primitive mode of locomotion to which Nebuchadnezzar had recourse, when, as Mr. Rawlinson informs us, "he was no doubt strictly confined to the private gardens attached to his palace!" and "his subjects generally, it is probable, were not allowed to know of his condition!" while "the queen most likely held the reins of power." If there was nothing better than this in Mr. Rawlinson's new volume, we should have little to say in its favour. But there is much that is valuable and interesting

[7] "Descriptive Catalogue of Materials relating to the History of Great Britain, to the End of the Reign of Henry VII." By Thomas Duffus Hardy, Deputy Keeper of the Public Records. Published by the Authority of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. Vol. II. From A.D. 1006 to A.D 1200. London: Longman, Green, and Co. 1865.

[8] "Our British Ancestors, who and what were they? An Inquiry, &c." By the Rev. Samuel Lysons, M.A., F.S.A. Oxford and London. 1865.

[9] "The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World; or, the History, Geography, and Antiquities of Chaldæa, Assyria, Babylon, Media, and Persia." Collected and Illustrated from Ancient and Modern Sources. By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College. In four volumes. Vol. III. London: Murray. 1865.

in it. The two monarchies described in it are that of Media, being the third monarchy, and that of Babylonia, or the fourth. The climate, productions, character, manners, language, literature, science, and history, form the topics of the chapters into which the volume is divided. The arrangement seems judicious, the presentment of facts is tolerably attractive, the geographical survey is comprehensive and readable, and the style is clear, manly, and unaffected. The chapter on the religion of the Medes is, we think, the most noticeable in the book. The earliest form of this religion, according to our author, is to be found in what are regarded on internal evidence as the oldest sections of the Zendavesta, perhaps dating back to the time of Moses. Before the rise of the Median, Iranic, or Persian system, there was "a sensuous and superficial nature-worship," common to the eastern and western branches of the Arian race. From this nature-worship the Median system was a revolt. Dividing the spiritual intelligences which it recognized into good and evil, it subordinated them to a single great intelligence, Ahura-Mazdao, the highest object of adoration, the true creator, preserver, and governor of the universe. Mr. Rawlinson, however, while distinctly allowing that the Median or Persian religion was monotheistic in a certain sense, refuses to concur with Haug in the opinion that this conception of Ahura-Mazdao as the Supreme Being is *perfectly identical* with the notion of Elohim or Jehovah which we find in the books of the Old Testament. Omitting mere over-refinements, and conceding that the Jewish idea of God gradually gained in purity and sublimity, we should find it difficult to point out any important difference between the Median god and the God that walked in the garden in the cool of the day, smelled a sweet savour, "came down to see the city and the tower," ate cakes with Abraham, wrestled with Jacob, and was seen by the elders of Israel with a paved work of a sapphire stone under his feet. That Mr. Rawlinson, however, recognises the religion of the Medes as not only monotheistic, but as anti-idolatrous, is a noticeable and instructive fact.

In Karl Schmidt's "Comparative Tables of the Literature and Political History of the Leading Civilized Nations of the New World," will be found a clearly-arranged and compact summary of the social events and literary productions which distinguished, in the succession of centuries, the more important European countries—Germany, England, Italy, Spain, Portugal, and Scandinavia. Each country has its own column, and, to compensate for omissions, an extra or miscellaneous column completes the arrangement.[10]

Much has been said lately of the Simancas State Papers. The best account of these papers, and of the castle in which they are preserved, is, so far as we know, to be found in Mr. Bergenroth's excellent calendar. Mr. Spencer Hall, whose attention was long since directed to these documents by Mr. P. Fraser Tytler, has given us, in a little volume with a lively introduction and copious index, a series of extracts from these papers, which he professes to have rendered correctly, without the slightest attempt at style.[11] Of course the question is what is the nature and what the value of these so-called documents. Don Tomas Gonzalez, canon of Plasencia, appears to have written certain historical notices respecting Philip II. and Queen Elizabeth, founded on a contemporary diplomatic correspondence. In what relation does this work stand to the original witnesses? and who are the original witnesses? We do not see that Mr. Spencer Hall throws much light on this question, though he certainly allows us to conjecture that among them are De Feria, Don Alvaro de la Cuadra, Bishop of Aquila, and Don Guzman de Silva. The misfortune, however, is that these witnesses give only a second-hand testimony, inasmuch as they speak with the voice of the canon of Plasencia, and whether that voice truly reports their own evidence is a question that the translator does not enable us to answer.

From Simancas to Austria is an abrupt transition,[12] yet we venture to make it under the escort of Herr Springer, whose second volume is in our hands. In his history of Austria since the Peace of Vienna in 1809, we have a copious account of the great transactions of the revolutionary war in Hungary, as well as of antecedent events and changes as far back as the year 1840. The present volume contains five books, describing the genesis of the revolution and its maturity, and then passing to the parliamentary period and the revolutionary crisis, and in conclusion terminating with the return to absolutism. This return, however, has its bright side, in the historian's opinion, since the bankruptcy of Austria affords to her subject populations a splendid opportunity for the exercise of a power which will determine their own destiny. In characterising the revolutionary leaders, Herr Springer is, as far as we can judge, without partiality; at any rate, we do not discern any bias, except perhaps in the case of Kossuth. His complaint against the Hungarian chief is that he was revolutionary and impracticable, that his programme was the French programme of Liberty and Equality, and that in him the agitator overpowered and eclipsed the statesman.

In the "History of the United States," by C. F. Neumann, we have a detailed account of the occurrences which have made the great Transatlantic Republic the hope of one class of minds —the despair of another and opposite class.[13]

[10] "Vergleichende Tabellen ueber die Literatur und Staaten-Geschichte der wichtigsten Kulturvölker der Neueren Welt." Von Prof. Dr. Karl Schmidt, &c. Leipzig: Fleischer. 1865.

[11] "Documents from Simancas, relating to the Reign of Elizabeth, 1558-1568." Translated from the Spanish of Don Tomas Gonzales, and edited with Notes and an Introduction by Spencer Hall, F.S.A., Librarian to the Athenæum. London: Chapman and Hall. 1865.

[12] "Geschichte Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden. 1809. Von Anton Springer." In Zwei Theilen. Zweiter Theil. Leipzig. 1865.

[13] "Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amer-

The first volume of this work was noticed in the April number of the *Westminster Review* for 1864. The second volume, published about a year after, contains a very full recital of events that took place between the first presidency of Thomas Jefferson and the close of the second presidency of Andrew Jackson. In spite of an occasional commonplace against despots, and an anti-English bias, which is also occasional, we are disposed to consider the volume before us as written in a mature and reflective spirit. We ought to warn all sympathisers with the South that Herr Neumann is not of their way of thinking. He is an anti-slavery and pro-Northern writer, and would subscribe to the opinion expressed in the fifth chapter of the second book of the popular edition of the "Principles of Political Economy:"

"That the sons of the deliverers of the West Indian negroes should see with complacency, and encourage by their sympathies, the foundation of a great and powerful military commonwealth, pledged by its principles, and driven by its strongest interests, to be the armed progagator of slavery through every region of the east into which its power can penetrate, discloses a mental state in the leading portion of our higher and middle classes, which it is melancholy to see, and will be a lasting blot in English history."

The prepossessions now indicated assuredly influence our author; but he does not appear to us to have written by any means a mere pamphlet history of the United States. On the contrary, he tells the tale of American freedom, conflict, and progress, in a calm and dignified manner, dwelling on its general development, as well as on its special antagonisms—so, at least, we judge from the present volume, the only one known to the reviewer. The plan of the history is comprehensive, the amount of research creditable, the style clear and tolerably forcible, though seldom or never picturesque. One more volume will, we believe, complete the work. The present instalment carries us from the beginning of Jefferson's administration to the end of Jackson's. It is of course very full of interesting matter, and introduces us to many of the leading men of America—Adams, Monroe, Clay (a man greatly admired by our historian,) Colquhoun, Hamilton, Madison, &c. Personal portraiture, description of events, and a satisfactory presentment of political transaction and circumstance, are comprised in this volume. That it is dedicated to the late excellent President of the great Republic, in a somewhat vehement exordium, serves to show the spirit of the author. When the remaining volume shall be published, we shall perhaps have a complete and trustworthy history of the United States.

The story of the first war with America, the narrative of our differences with the Colonies, and of our military operations in that great armed debate which closed in the capitulation of Cornwallis and the freedom of the daughter country (a daughter no more), may be read with profit in Mr. Massey's reprint of his well-known and valuable "History of England during the Reign of George III."[14] Two volumes of the revised and corrected edition, in a popular and even portable form, invite and deserve perusal. The administration of Walpole, of the Great Commoner, of North, of Rockingham, and Shelburne, are all included in the period comprised in them. The second volume opens with an interesting chapter on the *progress* of manners from the Middle Ages, when "the Christian knight deemed it his highest preferment to be the obsequious slave of woman, and the marriage tie was never more frail than when women were all but worshipped," to the middle of the last century, when "the highest persons in the nation, from the king and his court downwards, lived in open adultery, when religion and its ministers were treated with neglect and ridicule; when drinking, gaming, and brutal sports were the principal occupations of gentlemen; when great ladies patronised places of amusement which the law declared loose and disorderly," &c. The period traversed by Mr. Massey is very important, and in its social and political aspects so nearly related to our own time (though the relation is often one of differences rather than resemblances), that we are glad to find so available a history emanating from so judicious an historian. Never picturesque, never daring, brilliant, or profound, Mr. Massey, while sedate in style, is sober in judgment, liberal in sentiment, and well-acquainted with his subject.

The story of the Indian Mutiny is related in nearly thirty chapters by Mr. Holloway, who, as he participated in the defence of Lucknow, justly thinks he has a claim to be considered as an authority.[15] Mr. Holloway has, to his sorrow, been a part of what he relates. He was severely wounded himself, and his wife, his sister, and brother-in-law "fell victims to the cowardly treachery and fiendish cruelty of the Nena." The narrative, written by a non-commissioned officer—for so Mr. Holloway describes himself—is dedicated to Lady Inglis, who attests that she has read it with great interest. Mr. Holloway, if deficient in good taste, and pretentious in his commonplace, has at least the merit of sometimes describing what he saw.

The Muse of Biography now carries us back to an earlier period, when Steele, the subject of Mr. Montgomery's memoirs,[16] was a boy at school, Lord Mohun, "the exceedingly fast

ika." Von Karl Friedrich Neumann. Zweites Band. London: Williams and Norgate. 1865.

[14] "A History of England during the Reign of George the Third." By the Right Hon. William Massey. Second Edition, revised and corrected. In four volumes. London: Longmans. 1865.

[15] "Essays on the Indian Mutiny." By John Holloway, Civil Service, late a Non-commissioned Officer in Her Majesty's 32nd Light Infantry. London: Dean and Son.

[16] "Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Sir Richard Steele, Soldier, Dramatist, Essayist, and Patriot; with his Correspondence and Notices of his Contemporaries." By Henry R. Montgomery, Author of "Thomas Moore," &c. Two volumes. Edinburgh: William P. Nimmo. 1865.

nobleman" of an English humourist of modern days, was tried by his peers for the murder of the comedian, William Mountford, and acquitted. Seven years after he was concerned in the fight which ended in the death of Captain Coote. Thackeray pictures Steele as knowing and seeing "all these people," writing and sighing for the beautiful Bracegirdle, beloved of Hill, the friend of Mohun; as going home tipsy in many a chair, after many a bottle in many a tavern, and as flying from many a bailiff. Against the jeering caricature of Thackeray in "Esmond," as well as in the familiar series of lectures, and against what he conceives to be the unwarrantable strictures of Lord Macaulay, Mr. Montgomery undertakes to defend Steele, already vindicated by Mr. Forster. The defence, however, appears in the form of a life, or rather of a biographical *omnium gatherum*, in which the central figure of the drama is almost hidden by the crowd of contemporary celebrities which environ it; for Mr. Montgomery has not written, or even tried to write, as an artist who gives due prominence to character, circumstance, or action by the omission of the accidental or superfluous. He intended from the beginning to tell us the story of Congreve, Vanbrugh, Pope, Swift, Addison, Tickell, Budgell, and others, and he has done it; but in doing this he has not written a life, but only manufactured memoirs. No doubt, however, there is a mass of interesting material brought together, and the portrait of Steele may be traced from time to time in a succession of dissolving views. Richard Steele, born at Dublin in 1671, was educated at the Charterhouse, in London. About twenty years after he was admitted as a postmaster at Merton College, Oxford, though previously matriculated at Christ Church. Leaving the University without a degree, Steele, like Coleridge, enlisted in the army. Lord Cutts, then colonel of the Coldstream Guards, to which Steele belonged, got him first an ensigncy and then the command of a company. Mr. Montgomery tells us that Steele particularly distinguished himself at the attack on the Castle of Namur in 1695, and the siege of Venloo in 1702. The year before this last action appeared Steele's famous "Christian Hero," dedicated to his patron, Lord Cutts; and shortly after received a practical illustration when this anticipator of muscular Christianity drifted into a duel with a brother officer. A nobler distinction, however, awaited him as the originator of a new periodical literature. In 1709 he commenced the *Tatler*, which Hazlitt preferred to the *Spectator*. This serial, continued to 271 numbers, contains the famous Bickerstaff portraits, which Mr. Montgomery thinks superor in heartiness to that of Sir Roger de Coverley. The first number of the Coverley papers, in which that famous country gentleman whose great-grandfather is humorously identified with the inventor of the immortal dance, is introduced, was written by Steele, with some six or seven other numbers, among them the "Coverley Household," the "Coverley Lineage," "Sir Roger in Love," and the "Coverley Economy." In addition to his literary work, Steele had, successively, a variety of avocations. He was a commissioner in the Stamp Office; a member of Parliament, from which he was expelled for writing two obnoxious pamphlets, though supported by Walpole, Stanhope, Addison, and other notable persons. After the accession of George I., Steele was made surveyor of the royal stables at Hampton. Honours crowded in on him. He was knighted on the presentation of an address, elected member for Boroughbridge, in Yorkshire, appointed commissioner of forfeited estates in Scotland, and, in 1719, had to console himself for the loss of 10,000*l.*, consequent on the revocation of the patent constituting him governor of the Royal Company of Comedians. In 1725, or about that year, Steele, who had, after quitting London with shaken health and impaired fortune, temporarily resided in Bath, retired to his seat of Llangunnor, near Carmarthen, having first made over to his creditors an assignment of his property. Amid the murmur of water, the whisper of breezes, and the singing of birds (to use his own words) he spent the last few years of his life, still struck with a new sense of pleasure. "I was told," says Mr. Victor (quoted by our author), "he retained his cheerful sweetness of temper to the last, and would often be carried out, of a summer evening, where the country lads and lasses were assembled at their rural sports, and with his pencil give an order on his agent, the mercer, for a new gown to the best dancer." In this charming retreat he died, September 1st, 1729, aged fifty-eight. Steele was twice married: the first time to a lady of Barbadoes, the second time to Mary, the daughter of John Scurlock of Llangunnor, Esq., to whom are addressed those playful, prattling, tender, and admiring letters in which her "Prueship" is immortalised.

Among the claims to a share in a sublunary immortality preferred for her posthumous client, Miss Berry, by an accomplished lady, who herself lives only in memory, are included her pre-eminently social existence and her acquaintance with interesting and illustrious persons. A friend of literature and of literary people, Miss Berry, we are reminded by Lady Theresa Lewis, had seen "the dawn of genius, leading to lasting renown, and the wane of power, health, and beauty, generation after generation."[11] Nor is it only as a spectator, but as an authoress, that Miss Berry has a title to posthumous regard. She assisted, perhaps superseded, her father in editing the MSS. bequeathed to their care by her admiring friend Lord Orford; she edited the letters of Madame du Deffand; she published, with a biographical notice, a selection of the letters of Rachael Lady Russell, and an original work, in two volumes, entitled, "A Comparative View of Social Life in England and France from the Restoration of Charles II. to the Present Time." In addition to the claims of authorship, Miss Berry had other claims to our respect. She

[11] "Extracts of the Journals and Correspondence of Miss Berry, from the year 1783 to 1852." Edited by Lady Theresa Lewis. In three volumes. London: Longmans. 1865.

was possessed of considerable classical learning, reading Martial, Lucretius, Virgil, and Livy with more or less facility. She had a sound practical, if not profound intellect, studying and appreciating the works of Malthus, and expressing her views on political economy with a distinctness and force which evince that she had, at any rate, some grasp of its principles. A tender interest encircles her memory, as sharing with her sister the affectionate regard of Horace Walpole, who called them his wives and darling children, Miss Berry being the chief favourite, though, in spite of the world's gossip, the man and woman were, in Wordsworth's language, but a "pair of friends," she being young and *Horace* seventy-two. With all these points of interest, the two sisters are not undeserving of a biographical notice. The three volumes which contain Miss Berry's letters, journals, &c., with an explanatory commentary from the editress, might have been condensed into two; but we perhaps owe much to the discrimination and forbearance of Lady Theresa Lewis, who, with two trunks loaded with literary material, has thus wisely economised both space and time, and on the whole has executed her office with taste and judgment. The father of the two ladies whom these volumes introduce to a generation that know them not, was the nephew of a Scotch merchant, named Ferguson, who came to London in 1709, and made a fortune of £300,000, which became the inheritance of his sister's sons, or, rather, the Misses Berry's father was ultimately compelled to content himself with an annuity of about £1000 a year, while his younger brother appropriated the lion's share. The earliest years of the sisters, born, one in 1763 and the other in 1764, were spent in Yorkshire. When Mary, the eldest, was seven years old, they removed to Chiswick. When she was twenty, they accompanied their father to the Continent, residing at Florence, Montpellier, and Paris, at which last place they became acquainted with the future husband of the renowned Madame de Stael, whom also they knew. In 1788, they first met Horace Walpole, some of whose letters, never before published, give grace and animation to some pages of these volumes. But their circle of acquaintance, as time advanced, included numerous celebrities, royal personages, as well as distinguished men, like Playfair and Lord Byron, or noteworthy women, like Mrs. Somerville and Joanna Baillie. Both the Misses Berry were recognised queens of society, reigning especially at Strawberry Hill, by the divine right that constituted them sovereigns. We cannot follow them closely in their triumph of life in England or on the Continent. Briefly, in or soon after 1808, they knew or began to know everybody: Rogers, Walter Scott, Lord Brougham, Lord Ellenborough, Lord Aberdeen, &c. In 1809-1812, we find Miss Berry at Blackheath, Kensington, Devonshire House, &c.; dining with the Princess of Wales, who addressed to her at least one most Princess-of-Wales-like letter, which may be read in the present volume; or supping at Melbourne House, or chatting with Byron at Mr. Montagu's. In the year 1817 Mr. Berry died. In 1824, the sisters left their thirty years' home in North Audley Street, and went to reside in Park Lane. In 1825, they selected a house in Curzon Street, their last abode. It was in this year that Miss Berry published her "Comparative View," which met with the commendation of Hallam, Jeffrey, Sydney Smith, Walter Scott, and other eminent persons. In 1843, the health of Agnes, the younger sister, declined, and that of Miss Berry herself became less robust. In January, 1852, Agnes died, and in November of the same year Mary followed her sister, having counted nearly ninety years of joy and sorrow. Miss Berry had what would be called a masculine intellect. In politics, she was a Whig of the old school. With a thoroughly healthy mind, and not without natural piety, she resisted all religious encroachments, affirming that exaggerated ideas of imaginary duties towards a Creator, and of an eternal occupation of mind with one's *own* feelings and one's *own* hopes for *oneself*, become selfish and destroy all the little kind interests of life; and adding, as advice to a correspondent, "Beware of thinking you were sent into this world to be eternally occupied with the world to come, which I can never believe the way to attain it."

The sweet saintly soul of Eugénie de Guérin, whose journal has been so much admired, would have had little sympathy with this mundane wisdom. With Eugénie this world was but the shadow of that other. When her brother Maurice was dead, she followed him in her wild fancy into the Three Abodes. Turning from that of happiness, and passing on into the place of suffering, the gulf of fire, she exclaimed, "Let not my brother be there among the reprobates! Perhaps," she continued, "he is in purgatory, where one expiates the weaknesses of the heart, the doubts of the soul, the half inclinations to evil." And so she goes on, in trouble about the soul of her brother, praying evermore, with the hope that prayer might bring relief: "prayers for the dead being the dew of purgatory." Her Journal, already so well known—and, filled as it is with beautiful and refined thought and fancy, deserving to be so known—now appears in an English version, well printed and prettily got up.[18]

In Frederick William Robertson, an eloquent preacher in the Church of England, and a faithful servant of mankind according to his knowledge and power, we have another example of religious life and devotion, which we can admire and love, but only partly approve. His ideal was not that of a dreamer in the cloister, but rather that of a man who desired to realise every thought and associate every feeling with its corresponding action. The interest which we feel in tracing his history is augmented by the consciousness that he is a contemporary, whose doubts, beliefs, aspirations, culture, and circumstances have a certain resemblance to our own. We have lived over the same period, read the same books, had the same fears and the same hopes. Some of us have found rest

[18] "Journal of Eugénie de Guérin." Edited by G. S. Trebutien. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co. 1865.

as Mr. Robertson found it; others have been convinced that his solution is not the true one, and are still seeking that internal peace, that intellectual truth, which "systems" are usually powerless to confer on inquisitive and importunate minds. What Mr. Robertson succeeded in accomplishing for himself and some others, what he was, did, thought, and felt, will all be found sufficiently detailed in the "Life and Writings," edited by the Rev. Stopford H. Brooke.[19] The subject of this rapid notice, F. W. Robertson, was the eldest of the seven children of Frederick and Sarah Robertson, and was born in London, at the house of his grandfather, Colonel Robertson, on the 3rd of February, 1816. His early years were passed at Leith, where he was rocked and cradled to the roar of artillery. At nine years of age he was sent to the Grammar-school of Beverley. In 1829 the family went to Tours, where young Robertson studied the classics, and acquired a knowledge of the French language valuable in after life. We afterwards find him at the New Academy, Edinburgh, a hard-working yet somewhat dreamy lad. The profession first selected for him was that of the law, which he detested, and, after trial, relinquished. Early prepossessions, and certain active and adventurous tendencies, perhaps, made the youth incline to the soldier's trade; but, after vainly waiting for a commission, he turned his thoughts to Oxford, and, notwithstanding his previous declaration of "anything but the Church," he was ordained a deacon of the English Church in 1840. His ministry was exercised in more than one cure: at Christ Church, Cheltenham; at St. Ebbe's, Oxford; and finally at Trinity Chapel, Brighton. In Mr. Robertson's life there is little of incident to be registered. He was a sort of model parson of a town; perhaps much what that typical personage in Chaucer would have been had he lived in the nineteenth century. He was great as an *anti-popularity*, yet deservedly popular preacher; good in his practical kindnesses towards the poor and suffering, and wise in his conduct; rarely, if ever, swayed by the stormy breath of passion. He had many friends, among whom we find Lady Byron; he had many enemies, none of whom have any individuality that we can see, but who are sufficiently represented by a certain low religious newspaper, which Mr. Robertson, we presume, seldom regarded and never respected. The labours of this noble and zealous man closed on Sunday, the 5th of June, 1853. On the 15th of August, in the same year, he went whither we all *must*. Besides his general culture, which, though creditable, does not strike us as being greater than that of the higher class of students in our own time, Mr. Robertson had talents bordering on if never rising into genius. But what chiefly attracts us in this man is his earnest truth-seeking character, his sympathy with the great topics of the time, his feeling for the working classes, and his views about politics, poetry, inspiration—in a word, his theory of life and philosophical method. Had he been a layman, these characteristics would have been less remarkable. That a clergymen should hold the views that Robertson held, that a minister of the English Church should acknowledge the truth that is in Malthus, should see a divine something in the French Revolution of 1848, should prepare himself for lecturing on the Books of Samuel by a course of political economy and secular history, should openly teach that the Mosaic cosmogony could not be reconciled with geological facts, and while he did not deny that the Pentateuch was compiled by Moses, should acquaint his congregation with the discussion on the *Jehovah* and *Elohim* documents—all this, and much more than this, showed a bold and vigorous originality that placed Mr. Robertson high above the *roturiers* of the pulpit. His Christianity was certainly peculiar to himself. He rejected the "Brahminical" doctrine of the Atonement, and, while in some sense he continued to believe in eternal punishment, he hoped for a universal restoration. He had his own views on inspiration, maintaining that woman's position is *mythically* described as a curse in *Genesis*. He could not accept the High Church system. He dreaded Low Churchism; he was no follower of Kingsley nor of Maurice; he thought the Bishop of Exeter and Mr. Gorham both wrong; yet, far from being a bigot, he recognised a truth or an excellence in modes of thought opposed to those of the Protestant churches in general. He saw a truth, for instance, in the root of Mariolatry, and spoke of Comte's speculations on the glory of women with respect. His philosophical method might accordingly be described as eclectic, if we did not prefer to characterize it as intuitional or sentimental. Even for a belief in the most fundamental of all religious doctrines—the existence of God—he did not look for evidence of an argumentative kind; and of the intellectual conception of God as Creator, Cause Immanent, Life, &c., he was not prepared to assert or deny anything. My God, he says, is not the philosopher's God; and he goes on to question the goodness and wisdom, in some aspects, of the external world, and to declare his dissatisfaction with the argument of design, of which he had previously said that, though valuable for edification and defence, yet "for proving God's existence or demonstrating to one well-informed infidel the falsity of his opinion, I believe it ever has been and ever must be powerless." We cannot find any distinct formal statement of Mr. Robertson's method of ascertaining truth. His language is not explicit. Truth is discovered by the soul, he says; it is intuitive, it is felt, it is transcendental. Such, at least, seems to be the meaning of various passages scattered over these volumes. For ourselves, we do not believe in transcendental metaphysics; and Mr. Robertson's convictions seem to us often merely subjective. He disdains proof and disparages the understanding. He proffers to our acceptance so many hypothe-

[19] "Life and Writings of Frederick W. Robertson, M.A., Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 1847-53." Edited by Stopford H. Brooke, M.A., late Chaplain to the Embassy at Berlin. In two volumes. With portraits. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

ses harmonizing with his own feelings, and gives us, not "reasoned truth," but unverified assumptions, which, for aught we know, may proceed from the prepossessions of education, the suggestions of fancy, or the demands of the undisciplined emotions. This is his cardinal weakness. He builds, in our judgment, without foundations. His house may be beautiful, but it is erected on the sands. The doom of such a house we all know. Yet with many abatements Mr. Robertson's mind was, in its degree and kind, a noble, wise, suggestive mind. Embalmed in this *Life and Letters*, it will influence many for good, and contribute towards the rise of that purer, broader Christianity which will, perhaps, supplant the antagonist systems which he deprecated, though, with his characteristic comprehensiveness of vision, he saw a soul of goodness in them. We shall only add that the editor has done his work, in the main, in a workmanly way.

With Watt and Boulton we descend from the celestial region to this visible diurnal sphere. Mr. Smiles's new volume concludes the author's "Lives of the Engineers." [20] The life of James Watt, the practical inventor and introducer of the condensing engine, though in preparation many years ago, was abandoned by Mr. Smiles on finding that the literary executor of the late Mr. Watt, of Aston Hall, Birmingham, had already taken the subject in hand. A subsequent examination of documents brought from Soho, including the original correspondence of Watt, Small, Boulton, and others, led Mr. Smiles to think that the story of Watt's life was one that would well bear to be retold in connexion with the life and labours of Matthew Boulton, of Soho. The biography is introduced by a preliminary history of the invention, or rather with a continuous notice of the men who served as pioneers to progress—the Marquis of Worcester, Papin, Savery, and Newcomen. We then come to the chapter which supplies the details of the lineage and birthplace, boyhood, and apprenticeship of James Watt. Watt was born at Greenock, on the Clyde, on the 19th of January, 1736, of industrious, intelligent, and pious parents. He showed, in early life, a considerable talent for fictitious narrative, his improvised tales being both humorous and pathetic. He made some progress in the rudiments of Latin and Greek at the Grammar School of his native town, and was more successful in the study of mathematics, under Mr. John Marr. At eighteen years of age he was sent to Glasgow to learn the trade of a mathematical instrument-maker. Refused permission to begin business in Glasgow, he found an asylum in the college, made friends with the professors, and entered into intimate relations with Robison. Mr. Smiles describes their conferences on the power of steam, and acquaints us with Watt's first idea of the condensing engine. His various difficulties, his improvements, his partnership with Roebuck, his continued experiments, and their failure after Roebuck's ruin, the association between Watt and Boulton, and the successful manufacture of engines, are next detailed, the story of Boulton's life being combined with that of Watt after the first hundred and sixty pages. The two men, who eventually became partners, seem to have been in some sort complementary characters: Watt having genius without business habits, and Boulton to a realizing imagination adding a slight aptitude for business details. Boulton, too, was cheerful and self-sustained, while Watt, a constant invalid, at least till more advanced life, was despondent, anxious, and melancholy. Of their common struggles and common triumphs we can give no sketch in this place. Mr. Smiles has told the tale in his clear, manly style, with sufficient anecdote to illustrate and enrich the narrative, and sufficient technical or scientific explanation to make his readers understand the nature of the inventions and experiments which he records. James Watt died on the 19th of August, 1819, in the eighty-third year of his age, and was buried near his deceased friend and partner, Mr. Boulton, in Handsworth Church. The epitaph, written by Lord Brougham, and inscribed on Chantrey's colossal statue of Watt, in Westminster Abbey, is pronounced by Mr. Smiles beyond comparison the finest lapidary inscription in the English language:—"Not to perpetuate a name which must endure while the peaceful arts flourish, but to show that mankind have learned to honour those who best deserve their gratitude; the King, his ministers, and many of the nobles and commoners of the realm raised this monument to James Watt, who, directing the force of an original genius, early exercised philosophical research to the improvement of the steam-engine, enlarged the resources of his country, increased the power of man, and rose to an eminent place among the most illustrious followers of science and the real benefactors of the world. Born at Greenock, 1786. Died at Heathfield, in Staffordshire, 1819." Those who would see the justification of this eulogy may be referred to the pages of Watt's latest biographer.

A work of a very different kind awaits the reader of the "History of the New Cæsar." [21] M. P. Vesinier, with a wholesale and indiscriminating hatred of Louis Napoleon, has portrayed him as a conspirator, and narrated his two famous exploits at Strasbourg and Boulogne in vehement and almost abusive language. In page 136 he writes:—"D'après ce qui précède il est facile de comprendre quel est le genre de gloire et d'honneur qui serait rentré dès lors avec l'insurgé de Boulogne, s'il eut réussi en 1840. Nous avons vu depuis le *Deux-Décembre* en quoi consiste l'honneur Napoléonien, et qu'il n'exclut ni la trahison, ni le parjure, ni le vol, ni l'assassinat, ni le guet-à-

[20] "Lives of Boulton and Watt;" principally from the original Soho MSS. Comprising also "A History of the Invention and Introduction of the Steam Engine. By Samuel Smiles, author of "Industrial Biography," &c. London: John Murray. 1865.

[21] "L'Histoire du nouveau César, Louis Napoléon Bonaparte, Conspirateur: Strasbourg et Boulogne." Par P. Vesinier, &c. Londres: Pierre Vesinier, 1865.

pens, car c'est escorté de tous ces crimes qu'il a fait son entrée triomphale depuis dix ans, et c'est grâce à eux qu'il est aujourd'hui glorieux et regnant." After such plain speaking we are not surprised to learn that M. P. Vesinier, *forcé par l'intolérance politique*, has abandoned the Continent and taken refuge in this country, where he hopes a welcome for his book as well as an asylum for himself.

A still more accusatory work has been written by Mr. W. J. Fitzpatrick, the biographer of Bishop Doyle, Lady Morgan, and Lord Cloncurry, entitled the "Sham Squire."[22] It appears that this appellation was the nickname given to Justice Higgins, who began life as an errand-boy, shoeblack, and waiter in a porter house, and became a newspaper proprietor, attorney-at-law, and the wealthy agent of the English Government. The publication of the Cornwallis Papers disclosed the fact that Francis Higgins was the person who gave the information which led to the arrest and death of Lord E. Fitzgerald, though our author contends that Counsellor Francis Magan, and not Higgins, was his immediate and actual betrayer. It is, it seems, an error to represent the journal of which Mr. Higgins was proprietor as a patriotic print, or even as friendly to the United Irishmen, and the romance which has been manufactured about the Sham Squire, and which took definite form in a story so called, published about nine years ago in a serial, has been entirely dissipated by Mr. Fitzpatrick. In addition to the life of Higgins, and sketches of his contemporaries, Mr. Fitzpatrick's book contains some curious jottings about Ireland seventy years ago.

The volume of "State Papers of the Reign of Elizabeth," introduced in an explanatory preface by the editor, Mr. J. Stevenson, relates chiefly to the transactions which occurred in the year 1560 between England and Scotland on the one side, and England and France on the other.[23] The expediency policy of Elizabeth in the siege of Leith and the campaign in Scotland; the paramount importance of Cecil; the self-compromise of the Queen with Lord Robert Dudley, "whose attentions to her have now become too conspicuous to escape comment," are among the topics illustrated in the Calendar. The volume also contains commercial documents, bearing mainly on our intercourse with Spain and Flanders; while the correspondence of the zealous but unscrupulous Gresham exhibits somewhat of the financial position of Elizabeth's government.

Three residuary publications must be rapidly dismissed. A "Brief Biographical Dictionary," compiled by the Rev. Charles Hole, is a small pocket-volume, in which each biography occupies a line, as—"Brindley, James, mechanician and canal engineer. Born 1716. Died Sept. 30, 1772."[24]

"Memorials, Archæological and Historical, of Chester, Manchester, S. Asaph, and Bangor," is a fragment from a collective history of our cathedrals, published separately for the convenience of the purchaser. Its author, Mr. Mackenzie E. C. Walcott, assures us that he has omitted no source of information.[25]

"Sketches or Studies of the Social and Public Life of Greece and Rome,"[26] lucidly and pleasantly described, discuss the social position of the women of classical antiquity, the art and poetry, the national feasts, the superstitions, amusements, and instruction of the people, in an age and in countries remote from, yet powerfully influencing, our own.

BELLES LETTRES.

A NEW school is rising. In America we have "black babble;" in England, "Cockney chatter." The Cockney, or, perhaps, as he had better be called, the Bohemian Chatterer, unlike other birds, sings chiefly in the autumn. Then the publishers' summer sets in, and Paternoster Row resounds with the Chatterer's cry.

To drop metaphor, there is just now a school of writers who threaten to overthrow everything that is valuable in literature. To political economy they entertain a profound aversion, but are learned in the statistics of Cremorne. In philology, their studies are more devoted to modern slang than to ancient Greek. Their satire is Jerrold at second-hand; their descriptions, Dickens at second-hand; but their ignorance their own. They write upon everything; and the less they know the more they write. Like the Polar bear in the Zoological Gardens, they are always moving, but never progressing. Of each of them may be said—

Πολλ' ἠπίστατο ἔργα, κακῶς δ' ἠπίστατο πάντα,

which may be freely translated by "Jack-of-all-trades, but master of none." They beat about the bush so long that they entirely forget the game they came to find. If they write upon railways, they mention everybody but the Stephensons; and if they visit a cathedral

[22] "The Sham Squire and the Informers of 1798," &c., &c. By William John Fitzpatrick, J. P., &c. London: John Camden Hotten. 1866.

[23] "Calendar of State Papers," Foreign Series, of the Reign of Elizabeth, 1560-1561, preserved in the State Paper Department of Her Majesty's Public Record Office. Edited by Joseph Stevenson, M.A., of University College, Durham, under the Direction of the Master of the Rolls, and with the Sanction of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Home Department. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1865.

[24] "A brief Biographical Dictionary, compiled and arranged by the Rev. Charles Hole, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge." London and Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. 1865.

[25] "Memorials, Archæological and Historical, of Chester, Manchester, S. Asaph, and Bangor." By Mackenzie E. C. Walcott, B.D., of Exeter College, Oxford, Precentor and Prebendary of Chichester, &c., &c. Chester: Phillipson and Goldes. London: Simpkin and Marshall. 1865.

[26] Kulturbilder aus Hellas und Rom. Von Dr. Hermann Göll. In 2 volumes. Leipsic: L. Wiedemann.

city, most scrupulously see everything but the cathedral. Their knowledge of botany is confined to the Upas-tree; their acquirements in ornithology to that Irish bird the phœnix; and their geology, to observations on the London pavement. In fact, the one cry that they all raise is—

"Possis nihil urbe London
Visere majus."

And yet they show their love of it in the oddest of ways. When Propertius used to sing De Urbe, he took a pleasure in pointing out that, where the magnificent streets now ran, formerly lean cattle starved on the scanty herbage; and where the proud columns of Jupiter's temple rose, once stood only a bare rock. But when the Cockney writes about his Town, he infallibly quotes the New Zealander and broken arches, and wails in the midst of ruins and ashes.

Of this school, Mr. Yates is one of the most prominent members. His new book[1] illustrates what we have said in many points. It is a collection of papers contributed to various journals. Amongst the many recipes for procuring a long life given by the older pharmacopœists, is invaribly found "scrapings of the human skull." We never really knew what they were until we read Mr. Yates's present volume. But our opinion, now that we do know, is most certainly against their power of prolonging life. Mr. Yates's scrapings are of all sorts and kinds. He writes upon all subjects. Indeed, his great difficulty appears not to be to find a subject, but a title. And generally so much thought is expended upon the title, that there is none reserved for the article. As with rotten nuts, the whole strength is absorbed in forming the shell, so that there is none left for the kernel. Thus "The Millers and their Men" is the title for a brutal prize-fight between Heenan and Sayers; whilst "Innocents' Day" disguises a flippant account of the meeting of the London Charity School children in St. Paul's. Mr. Yates, however, is not quite master of the hideously profane nomenclature which marks his school. Dr. Russell, whom, by the way, Mr. Yates admires so much (vol. i. p. 164), certainly excels our author, when he styles a paper on the Submarine Telegraph by the title of the most pathetic of all David's psalms, "De Profundis." Mr. Yates's papers are written in the fast, comic, slangy style of his school. But their substance, as we have hinted, is thin when compared with that of their titles. As, however, opinions upon humour always differ, we will quote a few gems. Thus we read: "The new proprietor was a youth of great spirit; no half-measures with him. He certainly did not fear his fate too much; nor were his deserts small, though in his lamented father's time, his dinners were said to have been restricted" (vol. ii. p. 6). To such passages as this, Mr. Yates, for the future, had best put a note to say they were meant for humour, so that his readers may know when to laugh. So, again, the following is introduced with an immense preliminary flourish:—"All the world's an omnibus. I am aware that Shakspeare has the same idea with regard to a stage; but stages do not run now, whatever they might in Shakspeare's time, and, besides, an omnibus gives greater variety" (vol. ii. p. 123). Now, grinning through a horse-collar, we should say, was an intellectual amusement compared to writing such stuff as this. Mr. Yates's general attainments are such, too, as belong to his school. He thinks it funny to be ignorant. Thus, in the "Comic Latin Grammar" strain, he writes—"A deer-forest is so named on the celebrated *lucus à non lucendo* principle: it does not contain a single tree" (vol. i. p. 187). Now, we have only to say that it is not so named. And if Mr. Yates will look, not in Johnson—whom every Cockney writer appears to think is the only person that ever wrote a dictionary—but in Wedgwood, he will find that the word has a singular Keltic derivation. Again, "So soon as the name is heard, the welkin—(what is the welkin? You don't know; I don't; but it's a capital phrase)—the welkin rings with shouts of delight" (vol. i. p. 257). Here Mr. Yates actually revels in his ignorance, as a savage might revel in his brutality. He is proud of his ignorance, but ignorant of his pride. Now, we do not blame Mr. Yates for his ignorance—that is a part of his defective education—but for his indecent buffoonery. Tacitus, in words the irony of which would be lost upon Mr. Yates and his friends, speaks of "sancta ignorantia;" whilst Shakspeare, in words which possibly even they may comprehend, calls it "God's curse." "Welkin," probably, is one the most instructive words in the whole of our language; and if Mr. Yates will condescend to turn to the first volume of the "Philological Museum," he will find there an article upon it, written by one of the ablest of modern scholars, in which its derivation from the Old-English *wolcen*, and its connection with εἴλλω, "volvo," are shown. Natural history has never been a strong point with the modern Cockney school. One of its writers lately spoke of catching trout in November, and grayling in April. Mr. Yates is about as learned. When he does write about natural history, he takes it second-hand, and cannot even give himself the pains to quote correctly. Thus Tennyson's well-known line is changed into—

"The wanton lapwing gets himself another nest."
(vol. i. p. 229.)

Now, the lapwing, we must inform Mr. Yates, never does, in the common sense of the term, make any nest: it simply lays its eggs in a hoof-mark, or any depression on the ground. Most certainly it does not, as we shall have occasion to show, like the Cockney or Bohemian Chatterer, take possession of other birds' nests, and suck other birds' eggs. After all this, nobody will be surprised to hear that Mr. Yates, who is so fond of describing society, has a grievance against society. It lies heavily on his soul. He mentions it touchingly in his preface, and again harps on it in

[1] "The Business of Pleasure." By Edmund Yates. London: Chapman and Hall. 1865.

the body of his work. And what is his grievance? Simply that, according to him, society does not pay proper respect to authors. Thus, in his introductory chapter, he writes, "Great actors and singers are, by a certain portion of society, classed with cooks, mountebanks, and horse-jockeys. 'That man who wrote the book, you know,' is the phrase by which Mr. Tennyson or Dr. Darwin would be designated" (pp. 1, 2). And again, with a bitterness which can hardly be looked upon as impersonal, he complains that respectable people actually have the impudence to "call actors performers, and ignore Tennyson" (vol. ii. 241). Now all this, as far as authors are concerned, is just about as true as Mr. Yates's derivation of "forest." We will not mention living scholars, who are welcomed and courted wherever they go, but bid Mr. Yates read the memoirs of Sydney Smith, and the life and letters of Prescott, for whom, according to the former, "a whole sea of Caspian soup" was waiting upon his arrival in England. As to Mr. Yates's personal experiences, we know nothing, but a man who glories in his ignorance as if it were an accomplishment, is decidedly not the fittest guest to meet either scholars or gentlemen. One word more; we know nothing, as we have said, about Mr. Yates, except the ugly story of his gross outrage upon Thackery. It would indeed be a pleasant thought to imagine that at a dinner-party your next neighbour may be a Cockney author, who is taking notes of the length of your nose, or the shape of your mouth, which will appear next day in print. That such authors are not admitted into society we are scarcely surprised. But no sooner have we done with Mr. Yates in one form, than he reappears in another.[2] The essayist suddenly changes into the novelist. Now we must remind the Cockney school, that "sæpe stylum vertas" does not mean, as they always seem to think, often change your style, but, what they never do, take some pains with it. If, however, society has insulted Mr. Yates, Mr. Yates in his turn has certainly insulted society. He presents us with two very different types of mankind. In the first place, he paints for us Jew-swindlers and convicts, and, in the second, baronets and noblemen. These he stirs about in three volumes, and calls the mixture a novel. Now, if we said that we understood the first group of characters, we might set up the claim of Æsop, that we were able to understand the language of the beasts. With regard to the second, we do not pretend to any special knowledge of the ways of baronets and noblemen, and if they are at all like what Mr. Yates represents, we should prefer to remain in our ignorance. To us they all seem to think and speak remarkably like billiard-markers and second-rate actors. Mr. Yates's opportunities for studying such society have, according to his own account, been principally confined to reading the reports of the Divorce Court. In them, of course, in the character of a moralist, he loves to study mankind—especially the aristocracy (vol. i. 278, 279, 280). Now, though we have not the slightest wish to interfere with Mr. Yates's peculiar studies, we must say we think his labours are rather thrown away. He would hardly, we should suppose, say that before describing the characteristics of the Welsh, it would be necessary to study the process of "bundling." If, however, his knowledge of aristocratic society is not very extensive, he certainly atones for it by a collection of second-hand stories. Thus the joke of the parson, who knew when woodcocks came in by the Lesson of the day, is, to say the least, twenty years old, whilst that of the master who observed that he never spoke to grooms except to give orders, is equally venerable. It would, perhaps, save authors the trouble of copying, if in future they gave orders to the binder to interleave their works with a few pages of Joe Miller. But not in jokes alone does Mr. Yates condescend to copy. All is game that comes to his bag. Like Robin Hood in the ballad,

> "He's a bag for meal, and a bag for malt,
> A bag for barley and corn,
> A bag for bread, and a bag for beef,
> And a bag for his little horn."

This last he most certainly has, and, if report speaks truly, he blows it regularly every Monday morning. The *flâneur* has become an institution. Like many more, Mr. Yates has become too idle to think for himself. Thus we always imagined that the description of a man "who never opened his mouth except to fill it" (vol. ii. p. 1) was as old, at least, as South's time. But prose and poetry alike pay toll into Mr. Yates's exchequer. And so Keats' "green-robed senators of mighty woods" become, in Mr. Yates's version, "tall patriarchal trees, which stood in unending conclave" (vol. ii. p. 193). Darwin's theory accounts for most phenomena in nature, except parasites. They still defy all explanation. In South America, there is the cuckoo-bee, that seizes the cells of the working-bee; in North America, the cow-bird, that lays its eggs in the nests of other birds. But England is richer still, for it is blest with both the cuckoo and the Cockney Chatterer. A distinction, however, must be made between the two—that whilst the cuckoo only lays its eggs in the lark's nest, the Cockney Chatterer takes the lark's eggs and calls them its own. But as the student of the Divorce Court Mr. Yates chiefly shines. His novel, it is but justice to him to say, has the true Divorce Court aroma. The usual profligate husband, and the usual profligate wife form the leading characters, whilst the minor are supported by the regulation French maid, and a convict governess. But the Divorce Courts are not enough for Mr. Yates. As he remarks, though he has studied the Divorce Courts attentively, there is one side of the adulterer's character which has never there been presented to the public gaze (vol. i. p. 278). Impelled, therefore, by, doubtless, the purest of motives, he has drawn from the depths of his inner consciousness an entirely original adulterer. We are certainly not going to analyse the conduct or motives of any of

[2] "Running the Gauntlet." A Novel. By Edmund Yates. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1865.

these people." For those who relish such company, we will only say to Mr. Yates, "*Euge, puer; macte virtute tuâ.*" Proceed in your Divorce Court studies. Bees can make honey out of any dirt, and sugar may be obtained from dung. It is hardly to be supposed that a Divorce Court student will know much about nature and natural scenery. Mr. Yates's views, however, are curious. Thus he describes the trees at Knockholt Park as being covered "with a wide-spread mantle of green and russet" (vol. ii. p. 193). Now as trees are commonly green in the spring, and russet only in the autumn, the Knockholt trees are decidedly a natural curiosity. As to his philosophy, the Divorce Court student is good enough to sum it up for our benefit in a few concise words. Thus we are told "*Nil admirari* is adopted in due seriousness and solemnity by the calm student of life" (vol. ii. p. 209). The fact, however, that we have not adopted the motto of admiring nothing, may, perhaps, account for our obtuseness in not being able to admire any portion of Mr. Yates's writings.

Everything that Mr. Meredith writes is sure to be clever. Over-cleverness, indeed, is his fault; and over-cleverness has the same effect on a book that over-dressiness has on a human being. In his present novel[3] this fault is very conspicuous. His heroine, Farmer William, John, Master Gammon, and the scenes in which they are placed evidently owe their inspiration to a study of George Eliot. And Mr. Meredith throughout the three volumes, is constantly attempting to give us those homely descriptions of farm life, those rustic sayings, which stamp such an individuality on all that George Eliot writes. But his power is here weak, and his cleverness only makes his weakness more apparent. He never reaches George Eliot's incisiveness; he never gains that concentrated force by which in one or two words she reveals a character. Thus, he makes his rustics talk about London, but he never reaches such a description as we once heard from the lips of a Wiltshire shepherd, "Danged if the streets there been't fifteen hurdles athwert." He describes horsy rustics, but he never puts such a sentence into their mouths as we once heard in Yorkshire, that county *optum equis*, from a horse-dealer on seeing a lion in a show, "Please, sir, has that 'ere lion been clipped?" He is constantly hitting round the nail, but never hits it, or, if he does, hits it on one side. George Eliot with one stroke drives home. We feel that what her characters say is precisely what they did say, and nothing else, and that you can substitute nothing better. This we do not feel with Mr. Meredith; and this is precisely the gulf that yawns between genius and mere cleverness. But Mr. Meredith is over-clever. Thus, he introduces us to a Hampshire farmer, who fattens sheep upon melons. When we read this we feel as we do when we read, in the Song of Solomon, "take us the foxes, the little foxes, that spoil the vines." The facts are probably true in both cases, but they do not come under our observation, and therefore do not strike us as natural. George Eliot would most probably have made her farmer interested in a peculiar breed of Hampshire pigs, and so maintained a local colouring. A writer like Bulwer Lytton, who is essentially a clever man without a spark of genius, would have inevitably fallen into some mistake similar to Mr. Meredith's. Mr. Disraeli would doubtless have indulged in the mysteries of a "cross" between a Southdown and a Cotswold. We are not for a moment impugning Mr. Meredith's facts. The lion, we all know, in Africa, refreshes himself on the water-melon, and we have no doubt that the "Cotswold lion," as a Cotswold ram is commonly called in Gloucestershire, would if he had the opportunity, do the same. We are simply pointing out the effects of over-cleverness. Mr. Meredith must not be confounded with the writers of the Cockney school. He takes pains; as a rule too, avoids all slang, and has a real love for Nature. Yet every now and then we come upon passages, the absurdity of which we know not whether to ascribe to carelessness or a mere straining after fine things. Thus, to take only a few examples, we read, "The days at a well-ordered country house, where a divining lady rules, speed to the measure of a waltz, in harmonious circles, dropping like crystals into the gulf of Time, and appearing to write nothing in his book" (vol. i. p. 271). Whatever the philosophers may think of space, Mr. Meredith is determined that time shall not be a mere mental phenomenon. Here the days first waltz, then crystallize themselves, after which we are hardly surprised that they can't write. And then, what is a "divining lady" at a country house, a spiritualist, or what? So, too, Mr. Meredith talks of a "skimming cab" (vol. ii. p. 207). This is one of those things that are too good to believe in, or, if they exist, should be kept on purpose for the hero or the heroine; and not, as in this case, for the two villains of the story. So, too, he paints for us a lady with "soft blue eyes, out of which a thousand needles flew" (vol. ii. p. 61). That needles have eyes every one knows, but this will be the first time, we suspect, that any one will have heard of the converse. Still the book is very clever. Its great faults, to our mind, is a want of sincerity, and this would vitiate far greater cleverness than even Mr. Meredith possesses.

Next to George Eliot, though at a very long distance, we are inclined to put Mrs. Trafford, as we suppose we must call her, for a certain masculine power. So strongly is this masculine power impressed upon all that she writes, that many of her critics, we perceive, speak of her in the masculine gender. Like George Eliot, too, she understands her art. She feels that in novels, as in painting, in the drama, in architecture, there must be one central feature, to which all others must be subordinated. Ignorant, or else forgetful of this principle, most novelists fritter away their strength. The effect is consequently lost. Thus, *Rhoda*, who gives the title to Mr. Meredith's novel, is decidedly obscured amongst the other personages. Again, with George Eliot, though in a far less

[3] "Rhoda Fleming." A Story. By George Meredith. London: Tinsley Brothers.

degree, Mrs. Trafford shares the rare power of humour. But here all resemblance ends. She has none of George Eliot's wide cultivation, breadth of thought, and spiritual and philosophical insight. As far as she goes, Mrs. Trafford is excellent. Her new novel,[4] however, hardly sustains her reputation. It is decidedly inferior to "George Geith." There is, though, the same power of fixing the attention, the same humour as in the election scene in the first volume, and the same happiness of expression, as when she says, "he married a nobody and a Roman Catholic" (vol. i. p. 25); and when she describes the coast of Galway, as "a succession of front doors facing America" (vol. i. 66). But the book is evidently written in a hurry, and if we may so speak, adulterated with an immense deal of fine writing.

If, however, any contrast was wanted, Captain White[5] most certainly supplies it. The scenes of his stories, like those in "Maxwell Drewitt," are laid in Ireland. But he has none of Mrs. Trafford's power of description; his best is not equal to her worst. If he has a good joke to tell, he spoils it with verbiage. In short, Captain White makes the mistake, which reviewers never forgive—he is dull. And the only way in which we can show any kindness to him is, by saying nothing about his book.

In spite of some extravagances, one of the pleasantest novels of the season is "Half a Million of Money."[6] It is full of crisp writing and easy dialogue. The writer, as Wordsworth would say, has lived in a world of books, and has also made the world her book. The title alone ought to render the work popular in a country where the eleventh commandment, "thou shalt not be poor," if not always obeyed, is always feared. But the book gives far more than the title promises. The hero, who has been bred up in the wildest parts of Switzerland, inherits four millions, and a wicked cousin. The young savage, up to the time of his windfall, does not know what a Bank of England note is. The barbarian is ignorant of I. O. U's. Civilization, however, acquaints him not only with the latter, but with forgeries. Good society shows him ingratitude, and other polite vices. The work is full of clever incisive sayings, and is marked by an absence of all vulgarity, which is quite refreshing in these days of sensationalism. The third volume as usual is the weakest. To borrow a metaphor from the stable, novels like horses, generally give way in their hind quarters. We are bored to death with trains, mails, and expresses. The cheque-book in the first two volumes is all very well, but *Bradshaw* soon becomes intolerable. The humour, too, runs thinner than it should. Why need a lady, who can write such dialogues as we find in the first volume, imitate Mr. Dickens' later bastard wit, and describe a sovereign in such round-about way, as "her Majesty's profile in a low relief on a neat pocket medallion" (vol. ii. p. 282)? This is not humour, but the sham sort of wit which Mr. Yates and the other followers of Dickens try to pass off for genuine coin. Miss Edwards must take care that she does not fall into this style.

Mr. Leighton's' theories as to what a novel should be are more valuable than his practice. In his former works he has shown some real power for story-telling and the development of a plot. Whether his theory has taken away his power, we know not; but certainly a more absurd story than "Shelburn" would be difficult to find. It deserves not criticism, but that pity which is certainly not akin to love. In "Faith Unwin's Ordeal"[8] we have a heroine, who at first promises to be a second "Griselda," and then a "Lord of Burleigh's Wife," but eventually turns out neither. Ladies will certainly take an interest in the career of an Australian girl, who, as a bride, presides with such grace at dinner, and tames an untameable nobleman. For many, the story possesses hardly enough movement. But those who like a quiet tale, with characters clearly and pleasantly sketched, told in a quiet style, will certainly read Miss Craik's new work with pleasure.

One of the most remarkable proofs of the nation's progress may be found in the number of recent translations. Peers and commoners, statesmen and divines, alike contribute to the common stock. Fifty years ago Lord Derby's translation of the "Iliad" would have been read only by a few scholars. But now, as Mr. Musgrave in the preface to his translation of the "Odyssey" remarks, a *novus ordo* has arisen. The retired tradesman, and merchant, and manufacturer, are now eager to learn what other men, under different skies, different governments, and different religions to their own, have felt and thought. Homer just now appears to be the favourite. First comes Mr. Dart's rendering of the "Iliad" into hexameters.[9] Our objection to this rendering has been anticipated by Mr. Worsley in his preface—that there is really no such metre as English hexameter. There is, indeed, a lumbering kind of verse, which cannot be scanned, but with difficulty divided into six irregular feet. Young ladies suppose that this measure was invented about ten years ago in America by Longfellow, and has been patented in England by the Rev. Charles Kingsley. In America its rhythm has been described as somewhat similar to the noise of pumpkins rolling over a barn floor. In England, however, it has found at least two staunch advocates in Oliver Goldsmith and the *Times*. The former thinks that the difficulties of the metre may "be surmounted by an effort of at-

[4] "Maxwell Drewitt." A Novel. By F. G. Trafford. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1865.

[5] "Irish Coast Tales of Love and Adventure." By Captain L. Esmonde White. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

[6] "Half a Million of Money." A Novel. By Amelia B. Edwards. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1866.

[7] "Shelburn." By Alexander Leighton. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

[8] "Faith Unwin's Ordeal." By Georgiana M. Craik. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

[9] "The Iliad of Homer." In English Hexameter Verse. By J. Henry Dart, M.A. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1865.

tention and a little practice; and in that case we should be as well pleased with English as with Latin hexameters." Now, as all scholars would think that our standard should be the Homeric and not the Virgilian metre, Oliver Goldsmith's reasoning falls to the ground. The *Times*, however, is more precise. In one of those articles which have lately been both the amazement and the amusement of the world, it is good enough to instruct us that Mr. Dart "at times harmonizes his rugged Northern consonants with a grace and ease not unworthy of the Homeric muse." Now this is precisely what neither Mr. Dart nor anybody else can do. And the *Times* might just as well have said that Mr. Dart "at times, notwithstanding our London fogs and east winds, grows mangoes in the Temple Gardens with a flavour not unworthy of the fruit of the West Indies." It is but justice to Mr. Dart to add that in his preface he makes no such pretensions, and, further, that his version is scholarlike and faithful. But he is fighting against Minerva and the English language. We do not call it a failure when a man attempts to fly without wings. The metre, in our opinion, which is most suited for giving both the power and delicacy of Homer, is blank verse; and when opponents to it quote Johnson's saying, that it is a metre in which "a man may hope to astonish but not to please," they are only exposing their ignorance. No metre requires so delicate and so cultivated an ear; no metre possesses such breadth and variety. Each poet makes his own, and each generation its own. The Elizabethan blank verse is as different from the Victorian as the architecture of the two periods; and the blank verse of Shakspeare, Jonson, and Marlowe are as different as the blank verse of Shelley, Wordsworth, and Tennyson. It is this metre that Mr. Musgrave[10] has rightly, in our opinion, chosen for his translation of the "Odyssey;" and though we do not think that he is at all a master of its intricacies and delicacies, yet we are by no means insensible to the many beauties of his version. Like Ulysses, Mr. Musgrave

Πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καί νόον ἔγνω,

and possesses varied accomplishments, all of which shine to great advantage in his translation. He sees the picturesque side, and often most happily hits off the preraphaelitism of the poet, as in the conclusion of the Fifth Book. His great fault, however, is his extreme diffuseness.

That Mr. Worsley, after the great success of his "Odyssey," should have chosen the Spenserian stanza for the "Iliad,"[11] is only natural. No one can deny the melody of his versification, and the richness of his colouring. But the "Iliad," from the nature of the poem, is less susceptible of such treatment than the "Odyssey." In this case, what we hold to be the essential weakness of the Spenserian stanza for purposes of translation—the frequent use of the auxiliary verb, and the introduction of epithets and expletives to suit the exigencies of the rhyme—is more conspicuous. Besides, we can now measure Mr. Worsley by some test. We have not space here to compare his version with that of Lord Derby, and it would be most unfair to give our bare opinion of the merits of the two without quoting them side by side. There is, however something more important than literature,—our views upon life; and it has been with pain that we have read Mr. Worsley's dedication. If ever a man fought, not for, but against, the best interests of his country, it was General Lee. In upholding slavery, he waged war, in fact, not against the North, but against humanity. The name of Hector is, by some strange perversion of language, used as a term for a bully, but never has that great name been so abused as when Mr. Worsley compares the Southern General to the hero of the "Iliad." This much, at least, Mr. Worsley might have learnt from his favourite "Odyssey:"—

Ἥμισυ γάρ τ' ἀρετῆς ἀποαίνυται εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς
Ἀνέρος, εὖτ' ἂν μιν κατὰ δούλιον ἦμαρ ἕλῃσιν.

And it was to bereave the slave of his manhood, and to give unbridled license to the passions of the slave-owner that Lee fought.

But not only Homer but the Greek dramatists are being rendered accessible to the public. In our last number Miss Swanwick's "Æschylus" was noticed, and now we have Professor Plumptre's "Sophocles."[12] It is even more suitable to the English reader than the former. Prefixed to it is one of the best lives of the poet we have ever read, showing him as the student of life and of books, and bringing out those traits of moral feeling which are so stamped upon his higher characters. We are sorry, however, that Professor Plumptre, in order to whitewash Sophocles, should think it necessary to blacken Goethe. Young Germans fresh from Novalis are, we know, just now in the habit of so doing; but we should have thought that Professor Plumptre, with his wide knowledge of men and manners, might have refrained from the cheap sneer of calling the greatest modern thinker an Epicurean. To scholarship and general accuracy, Professor Plumptre adds a cultivated ear, and an unusually poetic diction, so that his version will be equally acceptable on the one hand to scholars, and on the other to mere English readers. The octave that Sophocles stretches is very wide. The famous chorus in the "Œdipus at Colonnus," with its καλλίβοτρυς νάρκισσος and the χρυσαυγὴς κρόκος, possesses all the colouring and richness of Tennyson, whilst the other equally famous chorus in the "Antigone" commencing πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ is pitched in the same key as Wordsworth's most spiritual odes. Professor Plumptre would have done both choruses equal justice had it not been for

[10] "The Odyssey of Homer," rendered into English blank verse. By George Musgrave, M.A. London: Bell and Daldy. 1865.

[11] "The Iliad of Homer," translated into English verse in the Spenserian Stanza. By Philip Stanhope Worsley, M.A. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood and Sons. 1865.

[12] "The Tragedies of Sophocles." A New Translation, with a Biographical Essay. By E. H. Plumptre, M.A. London: Alexander Strahan. 1865.

his unaccountable blunder in misunderstanding *δεινὰ* and *δεινότερον* in the latter.

Turning to modern days, Mr. Martin gives us "Faust."[13] He is already well known as a translator of Horace and Catullus; and they certainly suit his powers far better than Goethe. Mr. Martin succeeds well enough in all the lighter portions; but in attempting to be impressive, he often only becomes heavy. Besides, he is far from accurate. Thus, at page 73, "prächtiger" is translated as if it were an adjective in apposition with "mächtiger," whereas it is an adverb qualifying the following verb, bauen, and the passage should be translated by "more beautifully build it again." So, too, at page 142, there is a perfect mass of mistakes. Thus "an den" is translated "them," in spite of the singular relative "der" which follows, and this because the accusative singular is spelt like the dative plural, in spite, too, of the preposition calling for the accusative.

M. Chatrian's "Waterloo,"[14] too has found a translator. Like "The Conscript," to which it is a sequel, it possesses the same graphic realistic power, the same dry humour and pathos. If the Society of Friends and the Peace Society are really in earnest in their endeavours to show the miseries and horrors of war they should do all in their power to aid its circulation. The translation is very faithful, in fact, too faithful, and reads now and then like those interlinear versions of the classics, which are known to schoolboys as "cribs."

The science of language is every day receiving fresh attention. Archdeacon Smith's little work,[15] however, is, we must suppose, a burlesque upon etymology. "Calamity," he derives, without a word of caution, from "calamus." In some etymological works he will find "hurricane" given as a confirmation of this. Now and then he is sometimes right, but apparently by accident. Whatever Jamaica may be, its late Archdeacon is in a state of revolt against common-sense.

Mr. Farrar's work[16] is of a very different order. We are opposed to him in many points, but we could not possibly do justice either to his or our own arguments in the brief space at our command. We are, however, surprised to see him quoting Mr. D'Orsey, who is not of any value at all as an authority. Max Müller, we know, also quotes him; but, if we rightly remember, there is a great vagueness even about Mr. D'Orsey's statement. Again, the test that Mr. Farrar applies to the vocabulary of the apple-gatherers is most unfair. Were he to apply it in the same way to that of hunting-men, turfites, and clubmen, he would find them all talking in the same vicious circle of a given number of words. Doubtless, "fettle" in Yorkshire, like "fix" in America, and "allow" in Hampshire, like "guess" in the States, are used in a variety of meanings, which at first seems to imply a great poverty of speech. The richness, however, of our provincial dialects has never yet been truly shown. Our belief is that our best glossaries give only about one half, many only a fourth, and some not a tenth of the provincialisms, which they are intended to illustrate. In Mr. Farrar, Wedgwood will find a valuable ally. The weakness of Max Müller was seen the moment that, instead of facts, he gave epigrams. For some time past, to take a liberty with Horace, he has been repaying good gold with bitter lupins. The nicknames, however, which he thought it decent to shower on his opponent's theory, only showed the weak points in his own armour. And these weak points Mr. Farrar has pierced through and through.

From all men preserve us from ignorant Scotchmen. Nausicaa, in the "Odyssey," thinks there are no people like the Phæacians, and a Greenlander compliments a stranger by saying "he is almost an Innuit." But an ignorant Scotchman thinks that he is the model of creation. A good instance of this may be seen in "Lights in Art."[17] The man writes upon art with the soul of a picture-dealer. His mind is oppressed with catalogues and varnish. He goes into the ecstasies of italics because a picture is signed by the master's own hand. With an air of learning he quotes "Adam's Roman History," and the "Family Treasury;" finally, he concludes his criticism on Turner by "a more steady and refreshing genius appeared in John Wilson, a Scotchman, born in 1774." North of the Tweed, the last five words will certainly carry conviction of the truth of the first part of the sentence in the minds of all other ignorant Scotchmen.

Mr. Alexander Smith[18] makes a false step when he commences his travels by "summer has leaped suddenly on Edinburgh like a tiger." This is just one of those flashy similes which Mr. Smith's admirers imagine are a sign of genius. Summer has been compared to a great number of persons and things, but the more we think about the matter the less can we see any resemblance between summer and a striped carnivorous animal, with fifteen black rings on its tail. But Mr. Smith is guilty of a far worse fault than this when he thus writes about the Wallace Tower—"It is maintained by charitable contributions, like a lying-in hospital. It is a big beggarman, like O'Connell. It is tormented by an eternal lack of pence, like Mr. Dick Swiveller. It sends round the hat as frequently as ever did Mr. Leigh Hunt" (pp. 51,

[13] "Faust:" a Dramatic Poem by Goethe. Translated into English verse by Theodore Martin. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1865.

[14] "Waterloo: A Story of the Hundred Days." Being a Sequel to "The Conscript." Translated from the French of M. Erckmann Chatrian. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

[15] "Common Words with Curious Derivations." By Archdeacon Smith, M.A. London: Bell and Daldy. 1865.

[16] "Chapters on Language." By the Rev. Frederick Farrar, M.A. London. Longmans, Green, and Co.

[17] "Lights in Art." A Review of Ancient and Modern Pictures. By an Artist. Edinburgh: William P. Nimmo. 1865.

[18] "A Summer in Skye." By Alexander Smith. London: Alexander Strahan. 1865.

52). Now, all this may, for anything we know, be meant for "wut," which, as Sydney Smith says, "is so infinitely distressing to all persons of good taste;" or it may be the new Scotch method of praising their own by depreciating English poets. Now, if Mr. Smith had been writing Leigh Hunt's life, it would have been only right and just to have commented on an undoubted failing in the poet's character. But here Mr. Smith is sneering simply for sneering's sake. Leigh Hunt most certainly, whatever his faults may have been, does not deserve to be coupled with one of Dickens' low comic characters. It would be well for Mr. Smith to remember that Leigh Hunt was a Liberal when a Liberal meant something very different to what it now means, and that, as editor of the *Examiner*, he fought and suffered for a cause by which we are all gainers. But, of all men, what right has Mr. Alexander Smith to sneer at Leigh Hunt for sending his hat round? Has not Mr. Smith sent his hat round, and pretty often too—not, indeed, for money, but for what money cannot buy? Has he not borrowed—or, rather, stolen—thoughts and similes from every poet, dead and living? When poor Hunt borrowed money to keep body and soul together, it was with the hope, at least, of ultimate repayment; but what thoughts of repayment ever entered Mr. Alexander Smith's head when he borrowed nearly whole lines from Keats, whom Hunt befriended? We are sorry to be obliged to remind Mr. Smith of these things; but he has forced the task upon us by gratuitously insulting the memory of one, who, whatever were his failings, was of a most pure and unselfish nature. With regard to the rest of Mr. Smith's travels, he possesses no special attainments in botany, geology, or philology, to give them any high value. He is at times picturesque, and deals largely in word-painting, which it is just now the fashion to admire, and which certainly shows that he possesses the power of secreting adjectives.

The publisher has done all that it is possible to render a most popular book still more popular by an attractive binding, clear print, good paper, and marvellous cheapness.[19] We wish we could give similar praise to the editor. He has, however, contrived to emasculate Burton. He has added where he should have omitted, and omitted where he should have added. If the publisher would only find a suitable editor, and give us "Zimmerman upon Solitude," or "Sir Thomas Browne on Urn Burial," in the same form as he has Burton, the public will be his debtor.

From the *Saturday Review* several volumes of essays have already been reprinted. The present is by no means the least interesting.[20] The author unites good common sense with a union of scholarship and polish of style which is rarely met amongst journalists. The essays may show at times a little hardness, but they are admirably suited to temper the extravagances of Ruskin, and repress the frothy rhetoric of the two Kingsleys, and all those emotional beings who appear to think with a ploughboy we once heard, that as "one times nought is nought, and twice nought is nought, then three times nought must be summat."

In humour, we have this quarter no less than two reprints and a new work from America.[21] From Arbuthnot downwards, all humourists and satirists have shown a tendency to be of th shop, shoppy. Artemus Ward was, we believe originally a printer, and many of his jokes smack of the "case." His spelling is a printer's devil's joke, and shows how artificial much of his fun is. It will not bear translating—the true test of all humour. He, however, always strikes good-humouredly, and we regret that we have not room for his picture of the Britisher, who, because he is bitten by a rat in New Granada, has no faith whatever in the success of a republican form of government. The cloth shows itself in Sydney Smith.[22] The reprint, however, before us, contrasts favourably with the "Caudle Lectures."[23] Sydney Smyth was essentially a broad-minded man. And his breadth of view sprang from cultivation, and intercourse with the most cultivated minds of his day. Douglas Jerrold was essentially a narrow-minded man, with a most limited view. He may probably have most sincerely hated vice, but he never gives us the idea of loving virtue. Had he been a judge, we feel that he would have sentenced a culprit to death with "and may the Lord have no mercy on your soul!" His friends, of course, say this is a wrong estimate of his character. It is therefore all the more to be regretted that he has done himself so much injustice in his writings. The "Caudle Lectures" are, with the exception of his plays, likely to be the most popular of all his works with posterity. The publishers have therefore shown good sense in sending them forth in so handsome a form; but why they should be printed on green paper is a mystery. Green, says Shakspeare, is the colour of lovers; but the Caudles can hardly be regarded in this light. To the edition of Sydney Smith we have nothing but praise to accord. Every one should possess it who wishes to enjoy the playfulness of true humour, and to see how great an ally it is to common sense and common justice.

Christmas used to be the time devoted by our forefathers to eating and drinking, but now it appears to be set apart for writing and reading. Of Wordsworth it was said that you never could discover from him that men had stomachs; and from the advertisements of the present day one would think that men were all heads and brains at Christmas. There is a Christmas number of everything—of "Once a Week" and "All the

[19] "Melancholy Anatomised." Principally founded on the larger work entitled Burton's "Anatomy of Melancholy." London: William Tegg. 1865.

[20] "Modern Characteristics." A Series of Short Essays. From the *Saturday Review*. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1865.

[21] "Artemus Ward" (His Travels). Edited by E. P. Hingston. London: John Camden Hotten. 1865.

[22] "The Wit and Wisdom of the Rev. Sydney Smith." A New Edition. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1865.

[23] "The Caudle Lectures." London: Bradbury, Evans, and Co. 1865.

Year Round." Publishers, too, give us what they are pleased to call Christmas books, which generally mean books very fine outside and very poor inside. They are the kind without which no lady's drawing-room is complete. They are supposed to give an intellectual flavour to the knick-knacks on the tables, and are to be bought by the square foot. This year they are unusually poor. Many are mere reprints. Thus "Pictures of Society"[24] is a mere collection of tales and sketches from "London Society," a few good, many indifferent, and more absolutely bad. It is difficult to conceive what merit Mr. Crane's "Going to the Derby" possesses that it is thought worth while to recall its memory. The drawing is careless, and there is an absolute blunder in placing the driver on the near side. Besides, Mr. Crane's genius does not lie in this direction, and we trust we shall not again see him illustrating fast Cockney life and slow "Cockney chatter."

More original is "The Life of Man Symbolised by the Months of the Year."[25] The idea is good, and we wish we could say the same of the execution. But Mr. Leighton is essentially a geometrical designer, not an artist. He stands in relation to true art much as Longfellow does to true poetry. He is pretty, but this is the worst compliment that can be paid to an artist. Nor can we say much for the literary portion. There is a grave error in taste in taking the boastful quotation from Caxton as a motto. "Clerkys and very gentylmen" do not care for Tupperisms from Sir Bulwer Lytton, Hannah More, Mr. Bellew, and others, which are so freely scattered throughout the work. The binding, however, is perfect. This is always Mr. Leighton's strong point. This year he has excelled himself both in tastefulness of design and harmony of colour.

If any foil were wanting, it might be found in Mr. Bennett's edition of "Marmion."[26] Here the design on the cover is rich without being effective, and showy without being attractive. The inside, however, is far better. The photographs are, in general, good, and excellently illustrate the text. Justice is hardly done to Bamborough Castle, and a better view might have been given of Durham Cathedral, by going a little further down the bank, and thus more clearly bringing out the Galilee and the West Front.

The best photographs, however, that we have ever seen, are to be found in Mr. Stephens's new work.[27] They have a softness and delicacy peculiarly their own, which does much to reconcile us to that art which has been defined as "justice without mercy." Mr. Stephens, too, is always worth reading. His book is the best companion a traveller could possibly take to Belgium. His descriptions are good, and his criticism sound.

From abroad we have several noticeable books, Dr. Koffka's history of the theatre at Manheim, while under the direction of Dalberg and Iffland,[28] gives a very curious and interesting picture of the organization and discipline of a company of players at a German Court under the old *régime*. Another point of view from which the perusal of this volume derives considerable interest, will be found in the comparison of the *troupe* in Wilhelm Meister with the celebrated one here described, and which undoubtedly was greatly in Goethe's mind when he drew this picture. The publication of these theatrical records shows how closely he studied from the life, and will give, if possible, a greater reality to those celebrated characters which enliven the pages of his most important romance. It is very difficult to revive the evanescent fame of popular actors, however great their abilities. They leave at best but the shade of a name behind them. These difficulties, in themselves insurmountable, are faced by Dr. Koffka with great courage, and overcome with as large an amount of success as is compatible with his subject-matter. The period of course embraces the appearance of Schiller's "Robbers," and Dr. Koffka throws considerable light upon the poet's relations with Dalberg and the Manheim Theatre, which, without disparaging him, completely removes all ground for many unjust criticisms on Dalberg which are to be found in some of Schiller's Biographies.

The difference between Auerbach's earlier and later tales resembles in many points that which distinguishes the works of Dickens. The great popularity of their earlier sketches seems rather to have incited both to the task of undertaking the moral improvement of their contemporaries than to have satisfied either with their success in amusing them. The qualities which gave the Dorf Geschichten their reputation are, it is true, still to be found in the later works of Auerbach. They are, however, no longer cultivated on their own account, but merely to supply the place of garnish to the treatment of the largest questions of social life. In his last novel,[29] the questions treated of are large enough to satisfy any one, and amount to an ethical discourse on the whole duty of man; whether the solutions will be equally satisfactory is quite another thing. It may be even said with considerable justice, that they are not even clear, and that for practical purposes the doctrine is in the highest degree vague. Self-development and renunciation are words that have played a great part in such disquisitions in Germany, since critics have tormented themselves to give a unity to the teaching of Wilhelm Meister. But neither Auerbach in the present case, nor any one else that we are aware of, has laid down clear and sufficient

[24] "Pictures of Society—Grave and Gay." London: Sampson Low and Co. 1865.

[25] "The Life of Man Symbolised by the Months of the Year: In a Series of Illustrations." By John Leighton, F.S.A. With Passages Selected from Ancient and Modern Authors. By Richard Pigot. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1866.

[26] "Marmion: A Tale of Flodden Field." By Sir Walter Scott, Bart. London: A. W. Bennett. 1866.

[27] "Flemish Relics, Architectural, Legendary, and Pictorial." By Frederick G. Stephens. London: A. W. Bennett. 1866.

[28] "Iffland und Dalberg." Von Dr. Wilhelm Koffka. Leipzig: J. J. Weber. London: D. Nutt. 1865.

[29] "Auf die Hoche." Von B. Auerbach. Stuttgart: Cotta. London: D. Nutt. 1865.

rules by which self-development shall be in every case distinguished from self-indulgence. And renunciation, even in the highest instance of it displayed it the present novel, is not much better than the self-denial practised by Reynard on a well-known occasion. The story revolves round a royal intrigue, the progress of which is developed with a minuteness of analysis that would be the admiration of a Parisian novelist, if its method were not the antipodes of that to which such writers exclusively resort in such cases. There is not a word of prurient description to be found. The fact is assumed, not described, and the author's only interest is with the effects which are produced by the transgression on the minds of those who have yielded to its seductions.

An interesting volume of Essays on Shakespeare has been published by Professor Hebler, of Berne.[30] He relinquishes that symbolical method of treatment which has been so popular in Germany ever since Börne scourged the failings of his countrymen through those of Hamlet. This method has been carried to such an excess that it has become quite impossible to say what could not be extracted from any of Shakespeare's plays by German exegesis. Herr Hebler's book may be looked upon as in some sort a reaction against these excesses. He keeps fast to an historical investigation of the sources, and to a psychological analysis of the given results as they display themselves in the plays. The essay on Hamlet, which occupies at least a third of this little volume, takes up a new point of view in the summary of his character. Instead of accepting him as the embodiment of the conflict between the will and intellect, he founds with considerable ingenuity a theory on many of the chief passages to the effect that Shakespeare intended to display the self-frustration of overwrought passion, and that Hamlet's want of action arises rather from the intensity of his feelings than from any intellectual defect. There is considerable novelty in this view, though it presents difficulties which we think are not in every case overcome by the intelligent critic. Besides this, there is much also that will reward the reader in these essays, and the resumption of a more natural tone of criticism in Germany, of which they may be taken as a sign, is a change, without doubt, for the better.

M. Taine's lectures[31] constitute an epoch in art-criticism. With the single exception of Mr. Palgrave, we have not an art-critic in England. Mr. Ruskin is not so much behind the age as violently opposed to all its best movements. He shrieks like an angry woman at the name of science. Mr. Hamerton has written too little, and Mr. Tom Taylor too much. The former may, if he can but emancipate himself from Ruskinism, do real service. Of the latter, however, it is not too much to say that, had he never written a word, English art would have gained something. In these lectures M. Taine has applied positive science to art, has shown how it is subject to natural laws, and how the artist is the product of the age in which he lives. We need give no summary of his arguments and illustrations, for every one will, we trust, study the lectures themselves. One word only—we think that M. Taine somewhat exaggerates the melancholy of the representative man of the present. Werther and Manfred will not last for ever. Calmness of intellect, a wise forbearance, and the tempered enjoyment of life, will, we think, rather be his characteristics.

About's new novel[32] is a continuation of Le Mari Imprévu. Those who admire the earlier work will not be disappointed with the present. The author of Madelon knows better than we do what suits French tastes. In England he will hardly be appreciated. We do not, however, forget that we have a somewhat similar school of our own.

As usual, we have to acknowledge several volumes of the Early English Text Society,[33] and from Smith, Elder and Co. five reprints of novels in their excellent Illustrated Series.[34] Mr. Du Maurier and Mr. Crane here shine as artists. The female faces of the latter are always good, and his skies and scenery full of poetry.

---

[30] "Aufsatze über Shakespear." Von C. Hebler. Bern: J. Dalp. London: Williams and Norgate. 1865.

[31] "Philosophie de l'Art." Par H. Taine. Paris: Baillière. 1865.

[32] "Les Vacances de la Comtesse." Par Edmond About. Paris: Hachette. 1865.

[33] (I.) "The Story of Genesis and Exodus." An early English Song, about A.D 1250. Now first edited by Richard Morris. (II.) "Chaucer, Animadversions upon, sett downe by Francis Thynne." Now newly edited by G. H. Kingsley, M.D. (III.) "Morte Arthure." Edited, from Robert Thornton's MS. (A.B. 1440, A.D.) in the Library of Lincoln Cathedral, by George G. Perry, M.A. London: Trübner and Co. 1865.

[34] (I.) "Lizzie Leigh, and other Tales." By Mrs. Gaskell. (II.) "The Grey Woman, and other Tales." By Mrs. Gaskell. (III.) "Cousin Phyllis, and other Tales." By Mrs. Gaskell. (IV.) "Transformation, or the Romance of Monte Beni." By Nathaniel Hawthorne. (V.) "Romantic Tales." By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

THE

WESTMINSTER REVIEW,

No. CLXVIII.

FOR APRIL, 1866.

Art. I.—Railway Reform.

1. *Railway Reform: its Importance and Practicability considered as affecting the Nation, the Shareholders, and the Government.* By William Galt. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1865.
2. *Railways: in a Letter to the Right Honourable the President of the Board of Trade. A Plan for the Systematic Reform of the Railways of the United Kingdom by Legislative enactment.* London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1865.

If the fanciful supposition be for a moment indulged, that there should alight upon our island an intelligent stranger, hitherto wholly unversed in the modes and instruments of European life, it would not be without interest, and possibly not without instruction, to conjecture the probable course of his observations and conclusions. He would doubtless first be impressed by the glaring opposition and contrast presented by the extreme grades of society, lying, as they do, side by side, and inextricably involved with each other—the few rich, the many poor—the few wise, the many foolish. By prolonging his observations, he would notice the atoms that go to make up the whole framework of society ever in restless commotion, and rapidly interchanging with each other as their relative places become from time to time assigned by the presiding influences of education and wealth. These twin potentates he would watch ever gaining a more and more conspicuous ascendancy throughout the length and breadth of the land, their mark impressed on the aspirations of youth and on the labors of mature age; at their sole behest the boldest innovations less and less falteringly welcomed, and antiquated fallacies more and more unceremoniously exploded. And, in intimate connexion with this advancing empire of education and wealth, symbolizing, too, the resistless mobility of that empire, and more than all else effectually co-operating with it—the physical restlessness of our nation would not be the latest feature to attract our traveller's regard. In our daily, hourly passage from place to place, in the incessant communication maintained through every part of our land, in our instinctive abhorrence of even temporary insulation, our social, commercial, political, and scientific intercourse knowing no break, or impatience of delay or rest in work, our spasmodic activity, even when most in search of refreshment and repose; in all such symptoms he might complacently and justly believe he had found disclosed the truest exhibition of the temper of the age and country. Nor would it be an irrational conclusion if he went on to argue that, if it be true that all this unresting circulation and uninterrupted communion are indeed determining from moment to moment the very life of the nation, and, more than all else, nourishing the two feeders of that life—intellectual and material improvement—then, surely, must the organization of the art of carriage needs be the loftiest specimen of apt political contrivance, and be treated on all hands as not the least solemn concern with which the nation has to deal.

It demands, indeed, no eccentric sanguineness of disposition to form such expectations as these. It is all the more bitterly humiliating to reflect how wofully they contrast with the actual picture which a nearer view of the management of the country's traffic would reveal to the stranger's gaze. Imagine his confused surprise on ascertaining indubitably, after a pertinacious show of courteous reluctance, that, in a country boasting itself to be self-governed, in compliance with enlightened economical rules, the principles assumed to be applicable to traffic are not unfairly described as being of the following description:—

(1) That to as few people as possible, and not as many, be conceded the privilege of passing from place to place; (2) that from all invested with this exceptional privilege, an arbitrary impost called "profit," and amounting to somewhere about twenty times the actual or necessary cost of conveyance, be levied in favour of a select portion of the community, who, at some former period, under the cover of legal forms, usurped a position as detrimental to the whole country as it is likely to be suicidal to themselves, and which they now call an "inalienable right;" (3) that such an extravagant charge be laid upon the conveyance of the very necessaries, let alone the conveniences, of life, as to en-

hance exorbitantly their selling price, and put some of the most essential of them permanently out of the reach of the bulk of the population; (4) that the conveyance of the materials of manufacture be rendered so preposterously expensive as to discourage and limit such conveyance to a degree most depressive and paralysing to the development of the national resources; (5) that the safety and convenience of travellers, especially those of the poorer sort, and also the most numerous, be recklessly sacrificed, so often as the price of ensuring such safety and convenience threatens even momentary competition with the enormous profits of that select and favoured body before alluded to; (6) that the traffic of the country be regulated by seventy or eighty distinct corporations without any show of concord among themselves, and generally with a very distinct show of mutual rivalry and antipathy, exhibiting a perplexing variety of fares, charges, bye-laws, and modes of action, occupied ceaselessly in hindering each other—now forming temporary alliances, to the prejudice of all men but themselves, now buying up smaller lines or guaranteeing to them dividends in order to keep up prices, and evermore presenting all the opposite evils of the closest monopoly, and the most rampant system of unrestricted competition; (7) that the soil of the country, its single priceless possession, valuable beyond all estimate and properly saleable at none, be recklessly alienated in perpetuity, in tracts of hundreds of miles' length, to any body of speculators who choose to come and ask for it, and can make a fair show of fight with as many other bodies of competing speculators as, solely in defence of their own puny interests, think it worth while to dispute the claims; (8) that it is well to encourage the procreation and fostering of a swarm of penniless stock-jobbing impostors, who shall devote their time and special faculties to the imaginary delineation of new railways in every conceivable direction, no matter how needless, how extravagant, how noxious to the surface of the national territory, how ruinous to the legitimate interests of existing companies; and who, after encumbering the soil, and lavishing the capital of the nation in unproductive expenditure (even if the scheme be not abandoned at an earlier stage), craftily choose their time to shirk out of the undertaking, having first succeeded in passing on their liabilities to purchasers less knowing, but more guileless, than themselves; lastly, (9) that the sole test to be applied in every new railway adventure is, not the happiness, the improvement, or the wealth of the whole community, not the prospective results in a few years hence, still less in the next generation, not the local circumstances of any large area of the country, but, exclusively of every other consideration, the immediate returns to the shareholders in the way of profitable remuneration.

Such is a general picture, gloomy it may be, though of ghastly veracity none will deny, of the English railway system in the present day. If there be any who think lightly of such corrupt principles of administering so vital a concern as the traffic of a wealthy and energetic nation like ours, or affect but dimly to comprehend the viciousness of these principles, it is only another instance of the general difficulty in the way of reforming any great and widespreading abuse that always appears to be in some way commensurate with its very extent and magnitude. The well-known and the habitual never fail to generate an indolent familiarity and an unhealthy and uncritical acquiescence. To the slaveholders of the Southern States of America, no doctrine seems so monstrous and destitute of the barest plausibility as the human claims of the coloured man. To all Englishmen, not so long ago, there seemed to be an inseparable union, in the nature of things, between petty larceny and the drop at Tyburn, between a representative system and nomination boroughs. In the present day it is, similarly, just the largest question and the most widely prevalent pest that most signally fails to fix the attention and to invite systematic reform. So it is with education, so with the far-reaching problem of pauperism, with the municipal government of the metropolis, and with the wrongs or rights of Ireland.

It is the object of the present article to remove the question of railways out of this region of ignorant and patient endurance, and, by carefully investigating the actual facts and statistics at hand, endeavour to substantiate step by step the several counts of the indictment we have, in broad terms, above laid against the existing mode of administration. Side by side with the abuses complained of, we shall point out the enormous advantage that would flow to the public, and the results for good or evil likely to be occasioned to the shareholders, by a complete and systematic change of system. The abstract value of such a change being thus ascertained, we shall then discuss the special mode of reconstruction advocated by Mr. Galt and provided for by the Act of 1844.

The first part of the subject, that is, the necessity and abstract desirability, considered without reference to any special mode of practically carrying it out, of an entire change of system, we shall dispose of under two heads, which between them will enclose all the most crying abuses of which complaint is made. These heads will be, first, the fact of the extravagant fares and charges now imposed for the carriage of passengers and goods, together with the prospective results likely to follow from very considerable reduction in those fares and charges; and secondly, the pernicious consequences due to such a multiplicity of administrative bodies, such as they are, contrasted with those likely to flow from the institution of one undivided system of administration throughout the whole land.

I. In order to open the way to the consideration of the first head of inquiry announced above, it will be well to search for a precise estimate of the actual cost to a railway company of carrying (1) a single passenger, and (2) a ton of goods. Now there is enclosed a certain ambiguity in the very form in which the question is propounded. The expense of carrying a single passenger for a mile can only be determined by ascertaining the expense of conveying a whole train for the same distance,

and dividing that expense by the number of passengers in the train. Hence the answer, as to the cost of any one passenger, will depend as much upon the number of passengers carried as upon the actual expenditure incurred for the purpose of locomotion. We shall obviously have very different results according as we assume (1) that the train is as full as a train can be, which is only brought about occasionally, by means of what are called "excursion trains;" or (2) that the train is as full as trains upon the average are, calculating that average for a year over all the lines in the country; or again, (3) that, through lowering of fares or other causes, a train carries some number of passengers intermediate between that given on the two former assumptions. Now, our first object being to ascertain not what is the occasional or possible, but what is the average and actual profit reaped by railway companies upon the existing fares; the second assumption, that a train is only as full as trains upon the average are, is the one naturally suited to our purpose. "The average number" (we quote from Mr. Galt's analysis of official returns) "of passengers conveyed by each train in the kingdom is seventy-one, exclusive of season-ticketholders, and this class may raise the number probably to seventy-four; but, on the other hand, there is included in this average all the summer excursion traffic, the trains containing from 500 to 1500 excursionists, and, if these be excluded from the general average, the number of passengers in the regular trains cannot exceed *fifty*."

Now, as to the average expenditure incurred by the conveyance of a whole train for a single mile, we have two accounts ready to our hand: one founded upon materials supplied to the Board of Trade for the year 1863, and calculated upon the cost incurred by all the trains of all the railways in the United Kingdom; the other elaborated by Mr. Gooch, when chairman of the Eastern Counties Railway, for the purpose of satisfying the shareholders that the company was carrying at sufficiently remunerative prices, and calculated chiefly upon costs peculiar to coal trains. We shall (at least, for the present) avail ourselves of the former account, both as being more conducive to our object, and telling the most favourably on the side of the companies as against the public.

It may be interesting to present *in extenso* the estimate of the average cost of conveying a train a mile:—

	s.	*d.*
Maintenance of way and works	0	5½
Locomotive power	0	9
Repairs and renewals of carriages and wagons	0	2½
General traffic charges	0	9
Rates and taxes	0	1½
Government duty	0	1
Compensation for personal injury, and damage and loss of goods	0	0½
Legal and Parliamentary expenses	0	0½
Miscellaneous working expenditure not included in the above	0	2
Total	2	7

Thus the actual cost incurred, on an average, in conveying a train a mile is 2*s.* 7*d.*, and if this sum be divided by the average number of passengers, that is, 50, we have the cost of carrying a single passenger a single mile. It may, perhaps, be more convenient, in order to avoid fractions, to assume as our unit of distance 100 miles, that is, the distance from London to Brighton and back. Thus the cost of carrying a single passenger 100 miles is 5*s.* 2*d.* The difference between this and the average fares charged is the profit resulting to the shareholders. On the Brighton line this net profit amounts for the double journey, to a little over 15*s.*, or about 300 per cent. on the expenses. Now let us alter our assumption, and suppose that the train consists of as many carriages, and those as well-filled, as are capable of being drawn at a fair speed by a single locomotive. This is not unfrequently witnessed in the case of an excursion train, having 25 carriages, with an average number of forty passengers in each, making in all 1000 passengers, and proceeding at the rate of 20 miles an hour. Dividing, as before, the expenses of the train by the whole number of passengers, and taking the same distance of 100 miles as our unit, it will be found that each passenger can be conveyed 100 miles at an average cost of something less than *threepence farthing*. According to the proportionate number of passengers who travelled in the several classes of carriages in 1862, each first-class passenger would cost *sixpence*, each second-class passenger *fourpence*, and each third-class passenger *twopence halfpenny*. These are the two extremes of the cost of conveying each passenger 100 miles according as the trains are nearly empty, as is now generally the case, or completely filled, as only at present happens when the fares are temporarily lowered in the case of excursion trains, or of vehement and temporary competitions. On the third assumption that the fares are just sufficiently lowered to induce some intermediate number of passengers to travel, the cost of conveying a passenger 100 miles would evidently be somewhere intermediate between the average expenses already ascertained in the case of the two extremes, and we need not repeat the calculation. We shall have occasion to say more upon this further on.

Before commenting more particularly on these results, we must notice a remarkable fact, and one capable of demonstrative proof, that, while railways have tried every conceivable experiment and trick in the way of varying their fares, whether with a view to ascertain the most productive fares to impose, or else to beat out of the field some noxious competitor for the public patronage at whatever point the fares have been temporarily adjusted, in no single instance has the effect on dividends been to lower them more than *one per cent.*, and, in by far the more frequent cases, the most unfavourable effect experienced has been the lowering of dividends by only *one half per cent.* Let us take, as an instance, the memorable conflict between the London and North Western, and the Great Northern Companies in 1857. The Art Exhibition was then being held in Manchester, and, during the summer months, for two or three

days in a week, the companies gave excursion tickets between London and Manchester, allowing the traveller to remain four days at the latter town; the distance travelled over was about 400 miles, and the fares for first-class were lowered from 60*s.* to 7*s.* 6*d.*; and those for second-class from 40*s.* to 5*s.* The companies despatched fast trains, and the second-class carriages were comfortably cushioned. The loss to each company was calculated at about *a half per cent.* in their dividends.

Take again the dispute of the Edinburgh and Glasgow with the Caledonian line when the fares were reduced to about *one-eighth* of the ordinary charges. The Edinburgh and Glasgow line is about forty-six miles in length, and the regular fares for the three classes are respectively, eight shillings, six shillings, and four shillings. These were suddenly reduced to *one shilling, ninepence, and sixpence.* The Caledonian line similarly reduced their fares to the same amount. This contest continued for one year and a half. The result was that the Edinburgh and Glasgow Company paid *one per cent.* per annum less to the shareholders, and the Caledonian Company something less than *a half per cent.* below the usual dividend to theirs. Other narratives of competitive struggles give a testimony singularly parallel. Such instances, however, it will be recollected, are not adduced here by way of proof, for which nothing can suffice but a complete transcription of the reports supplied to the Board of Trade by the companies, but are merely noticed in this place by way of conveniently summing up an enormous mass of complex materials, and of providing a simple and intelligible basis for argument. The same observations will apply to the other statistical facts we shall have occasion from time to time to employ. The effect on dividends of spasmodic charges of fares is just what might have been *à priori* anticipated, from the considerations already dwelt upon, that the cost of conveyance varies inversely as the number of passengers; that, if the trains are filled, and as many trains despatched as possible every day, the cost for every passenger is reduced to its lowest possible amount; and the profits, which are the fares less the cost, proportionately increase, their actual value being determined by the amount of the fares, which amount, if very small, may not in all cases do more than just cover the cost of conveyance. It is plain, however, from the circumstances above noted, to what an extent fares may be lowered without incurring a detriment to dividends of more than one per cent. at the very most. We shall shortly see what ground there is for supposing that, were the lowering of fares, even to a still more considerable extent, a normal and not a galvanic policy, were the machinery, carriages, and methodical arrangements of companies constructed with the prospect of carrying by every train 300 or 400 passengers instead of 50, and had the public, by growing familiarity, adapted their habits of life to the novel opportunities of travel placed within their reach, the inland trade of the country, being largely developed, among other causes, through the vastly increasing conveniences of transport, in such an event the owners of railways would experience no detriment whatever, and most probably would even gain, perhaps largely, by the change.

In the meantime, and in confirmation of the position that the profits of companies do not depend upon the absolute amount of the fares charged, but upon the relation of that amount to the cost of carrying the passengers—that is, to their number, there is another series of facts which deserves careful attention. On looking at a list of all the railways in the country, with the fares charged and the dividends payable noted in separate columns, there is no mathematical expression yet invented which could generalize the ratio borne by one to the other. Some lines with the lowest fares pay the highest dividend; some lines with high fares pay no dividend; some lines with high fares pay a high dividend. This investigation is further interesting as showing the extreme variety of principle, or even capriciousness, by which the fares would seem to be regulated throughout the country. The North and South Western Railway now return a dividend of 6 per cent. Their charge for 100 miles is 5*s.*, 4*s.* 2*d.*, and 2*s.* 6*d.*, for the several classes, and is the lowest in the United Kingdom, as their dividends are among the highest. The North London charges a little more, and likewise pays a dividend of 6 per cent. This line is, for its length, the most expensive in the kingdom, its construction having cost as much for one mile as would pay for ten miles of an ordinary line. With respect to the variety of fares imposed, the Stirling and Dunfermline Company charge the traveller 50 per cent. more than the North and South Western; the Caledonian charge 33 per cent. higher still; the Lancashire and Yorkshire charge 30 per cent. more than the Caledonian; the London and North Western 20 per cent. more than the Lancashire and Yorkshire. So with the others in an ascending scale, till it comes about that the Carmarthen and Cardigan Company charge 450 per cent. more than the North and South Western.

We have thus seen that, if only trains could be tolerably well filled, through the removal of irresistible obstacles in the way of vast quantities of would-be travellers, especially of the poorer classes, that is, by a very great diminution of fares, the cost of conveying each passenger would be indefinitely reduced. The sources, however, from which profits are to be provided, are, from the very nature of the case, reduced at the same time, and so often as for a temporary purpose, the experiment has been hitherto made, a certain loss, however small, has been undergone. Now it is utterly absurd and out of place to make an appeal to directors, any more than to any other producers or monopolists, *ad misericordiam.* It is their nature, and it is even their duty, as trustees of the shareholders, to extract the uttermost farthing, in payment for their commodities, that the existing market admits of. Any temporary compromise, any indulgent concession to the pitiful supplications of the public, any hypocritical tenderness for the interests of the State, would only be an illusory and transient concealment, not the healing of the wound.

There are only two rational courses for the public to adopt: one is to prove, by an irrefragable argument addressed to directors, that a very considerable diminution of fares would certainly and immediately result in their being able to declare a dividend conspicuously higher than at present. The only other course is to urge upon the legislature that a systematic reconstruction of the whole railway system has become indispensably essential to the continued welfare and improvement of the community, and, saving the rights of all in possession of vested interests, not to rest till such reconstruction on wise and just principles has been actually accomplished. The public reasonably complain, not that directors are selfish, immoral, or unpatriotic (for this would be as futile a ground of objection as it is untrue), but that such is the existing system of railway management and tenure of railway property as to carry with them the inevitable consequence that, for ever so small or indefinite an advantage to the owners of that property, the largest interests of the whole community, and of little short of every single individual going to compose the community, must be remorselessly set at naught. The difference of carrying at one farthing, or at fourteen farthings a mile, may make scarcely a perceptible difference in favour of the dividends of a company: it has generally, when tried under the most unpropitious circumstances, made a difference of not more than one-half per cent.: it has never, in a single instance, been known to make a difference of more than one per cent. Yet, in order to secure this extra half, or one per cent., it is morally incumbent on the directors to keep up fares to the highest possible pitch, if necessary for attaining that end. We need scarcely even hint at the enormous issues, as to all that concerns the happiness, the wealth, the mental and moral improvement of millions of the population, that hang suspended on the adoption of the high or the low tariff.

Before saying more on this obviously just ground of national dissatisfaction, we shall advert to the affiliated subject of excessive charges for packages, merchandize, and minerals. It will be convenient to take, as a sample of the rest, that which comes nearest and most directly home to every one—the charges for the conveyance of coal.

According to Mr. Gooch's report already referred to, which we need not transcribe in full, the cost of conveying a ton of coal on what was then the Eastern Counties line was one shilling and fourpence for a hundred miles, or, from the pit's mouth to London, less than two shillings a ton; the cost of carriage per hundred miles is, no doubt, much the same on all the other lines. The price charged to the contractor by the company for conveying a ton was four shillings and twopence per hundred miles, or a little over eight shillings from the pit's mouth. In the session of 1863, evidence was given before a committee of the House of Lords by the manager of the Midland Company, to the effect that, after the company had brought coal from Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire at a charge of six shillings per ton, a demand of two shillings per ton was made for passing over the lines to Kensington basin. The result is that, whereas coal can be bought at the pit's mouth, in some districts, and transported to the metropolis, at a total expense of seven or eight shillings a ton, four times that price is paid for every ton on reaching its destination. The profits to the companies are manifestly three or four hundred per cent. As a flagrant instance of the public recognition of the most perverse claims of monopoly in the conveyance of coal, we may cite the recent rejection of the Bill sought for by the Great Eastern, which would empower them to make a line to the North, by a junction with their main line near Cambridge. The length, with branches, was 134 miles, and the estimated cost, 1,500,000*l.* They proved to the Committee that, so favourable were the gradients, a locomotive of ordinary power on such a line would be able to drag 400 tons; so they would be able to bring coals to London in any quantity at *a shilling* per ton. The Great Northern and Midland Companies determinedly opposed the bill, and it was rejected in the following memorable terms:—"You propose (said the Chairman) to have a railway with gradients such as no other railway in England has obtained; you can carry coals in trains of 400 tons load upon it, profitably, at a rate of one farthing per ton per mile; but it is not fair to other companies that you should be able to work at so low a rate(!) I do not see the justice of this proposition of a farthing per ton, and your bill is rejected."

This investigation into the existing prices and profits of coal-traffic has introduced us to a new cause, though underlying all the others, of the extortionate charges in excess of what is, or ought to be, the necessary cost of conveyance—that is, the ill-regulated monopoly which universally characterizes the existing system. The enormous charges are no longer here, as with passenger-traffic, because the trains are almost empty, and therefore the carriage of solitary travellers inordinately costly, but simply because the companies have it in their power to impose what charges they like, and they, like all other reasonable merchants, exercise their power to the full. It is the fact of such a monopoly being in the hands it is, and not the exercise of it, that is the legitimate ground of revolutionary murmurs. And as the terms "monopoly" and "competition" are bandied about in the discussion of the subject with more freedom than intelligence and precision, it may be well to step aside for a moment and ascertain what they here mean. Certainly the interpretation placed upon these terms by railway companies would, of itself, give us little light, for nothing can be more fluctuating and self-contradictory. So long as a company is before Parliament, menacing the interests of old and neighbouring lines, the principle at the root of traffic administration in England is, forsooth, and ever was, unbridled competition. So soon as ever the bill is obtained, it is found out that, as to all railway property called into existence from that day forward (at least until the company stands in need of a new branch), a special custom in favour of railways derogates from the common law, and declares the correct and sole

principle applicable to railway companies to be that of the most peremptory and stringent monopoly.

Now there cannot be a doubt that the axiomatic principle now recognised in all legislation, as well as justified by the most unquestioned results of economic science, and further fortified by the moral support of the whole community, is that of allowing, in all branches of trade whatever, unlimited rivalry and competition. Excepting the peculiar concessions made in favour of patents and copyrights, which are only ephemeral in their nature, and are themselves not exempt, in the present day, from the assaults of an invidious scepticism, in no case whatever does the legislature, within the limits of the United Kingdom, interpose in favour of the seller of a commodity, for no other purpose than with a view to protect his prices against the competition of others. But it is no less true that for other purposes of a public, moral, or high political nature, the legislature does constantly interfere, and it is admitted on all hands that it may beneficently and justly do so. On such grounds it rigidly confines, and ever has confined, on many sides, the general right of contract, of using property, and of inviting custom in open market. Because they infringe some wise, or unwise, restriction imposed by the legislature, or some moral notion recognised by the same authority, contracts are every day being unhesitatingly annulled in courts of justice. Because the laws of health, or of police, or the public laws of beauty are violated, after building a house on his own ground, and to his own taste, a man may have to set to work to pull it all down. The right of exercising a learned profession or certain specific trades, and publicly courting the patronage of the public, is hedged round with the most jealous strictness, with a view, not to favour the narrow personal interests of men, but to promote the general good of all. It is solely on public grounds that the universal principle of unlimited competition is confessed—it is on the very same grounds, and no other, that each exception to the principle must at every moment of its continuance strictly justify itself. The presumption is always against such an exception, and its life must be passed in animated and incessant self-defence. *Ubi cessat ratio legis cessat et lex.*

Now, applying these pervading rules of our policy to the particular question before us, it is manifest that all talk of free competition in the matter of railways is so much loose and inexact verbiage, or rather irrational cant. From first to last they stand upon a special and exceptional basis, to which the most broadly acknowledged claims of landholders, and the immutable interest of the community in the use and aspect of the national soil, have, by a series of legislative acts, been forcibly compelled to give place. From the nature of the case, no traffic but their own can compete with them on their roads. The distinct character and excellence of their mode of conveyance has diverted all the chief traffic from the ancient highways, and it is only through occasional competition with each other that they find, for a time, any natural and spontaneous check upon their exactions. It is obvious that the concession of what is practically an exclusive right of carriage throughout the entire kingdom, and which in its inception overrode the most ancient and indefeasible rights in property that the country knows, never could have been granted and never was granted, simply for the advantage of the companies themselves. An absolute gift to be irresponsibly used by some of the community against all, has been seen to be utterly irreconcilable with all modern policy and every recognised principle of legislation. The only possible justification of the very being of a railway company is, that the monopoly conferred upon them is exercised in a way to promote the greatest conceivable advantage to the public, consistent with a fair and reasonable remuneration to the shareholders for the capital subscribed. So long as railway companies in vain seek to justify their position in this way, they cannot look for the support of public sympathy any more than for the suffrages of members of Parliamentary Committees, whenever they appear to oppose the construction of an indefinite number of new and hostile lines. So long as those who can travel are charged exorbitantly above what would be necessary to ensure a fair profit under a reformed tariff, and the large mass of the people are arbitrarily prevented from travelling at all, to the injury of their health, their minds, and their material welfare; so long as an arbitrary impost of four hundred per cent. on the cost of carriage is levied upon one of the first necessities of life in this climate, coal,—just so long will the outcries of the public become louder, and yet more loud, till such a legislative interference be imperiously demanded as shall show far less tenderness to the vested rights of shareholders than that evinced by the Act of 1844.

Before concluding this part of the subject there is one matter to be considered, which, in the event of adopting a lower tariff, will be equally important to all owners of railways whoever they may ultimately be. Apart from a view of the social necessities of the people crying so loudly for increased opportunities of locomotion, and of the natural abuse of a monopoly once conceded to the companies in confiding simplicity, or rather fatuity, and without taking adequate precautions by way of enforcing obvious limitations in its use, it is important to form some estimate of the probable pecuniary effects upon railway property, as a merely commercial interest, of a reduction of fares. As with all other events in the future, so with this, we can only form, at best, a plausible conjecture, and, for this purpose, must turn to account, as best we may, the *data* supplied by the past. Now we have seen that the immediate effect of reducing fares by the inordinate amount of seven-eighths, as in the contest between the Edinburgh and Glasgow and the Caledonian Companies in 1854, and which continued for the space of one year and a half, was a loss of dividends on one line to the extent of one per cent., and on the other of one half per cent. A similar result is given by the history of other competitive fights between neighbour-

ing lines, and the result is not discouraging to the hopes of even the most sanguine advocate of reduction. In the case, somewhat analogous, of the reduction of postage at the end of the year 1839, to about one-sixth of the former average charges, an exactly similar phenomenon was presented. In the first year after the change the net revenue fell from one million and a half to half a million. It is only within the last year or so, twenty-five years after the alteration, that the net revenue exceeds what it was under the old system of charges. The analogy, however, tells unfairly against the probable effect of reducing railway fares, because a far smaller proportion of new machinery and additional organization, for the purpose of accommodating the increased number of travellers, would be required in the case of railways than has been rendered indispensable in the case of the Post-office. The quantity of letters now written, exceeding by 800 per cent. those written in 1839, the additional number of posts sent out, the novel and costly modes of transmitting them by land and by water, the remote districts and outlying countries receiving, for a trifling increase of postage, their post-bags with a certainty and frequency scarcely enjoyed by the great towns of the kingdom thirty years ago, all go to enhance, in a peculiar way, without any parallel in railway prospects, the increased expenditure on the part of the Post-office, and therefore largely diminish its profits. This analogy of the Post-office is only here employed to intimate that a temporary loss from a sudden lowering of charges is far from a sure indication that the new charges may not be, ultimately, far more reproductive than the old ones, especially where, as with railways, the cost of carrying every passenger becomes so notably diminished in proportion as the passengers are indefinitely multiplied.

The habits of a people with respect to moving from place to place cannot be changed in a day. It requires a new generation, growing up in possession of the new opportunities, and with tastes and tendencies yet uncrystallized by the freezing restrictions that confined their sires, to avail themselves freely of the boon. The poor workman would be among the last to profit from what would benefit him the most of all. He has acquired fixed habits of labour in the place of his birth, for (it may be) a pitiful reward, and knows as yet nothing of the neighbouring districts where work is abundant, and where every labourer can command his price. He has lived with his family immured in some stifling alley, and can only learn from experience the yet unguessed-at sweetness of being cheaply carried miles away to his daily toil, and of returning each evening to a healthy and happy home. These considerations are of special importance, because it is, even under the present system, from third-class passengers that railway companies get the largest measure of their returns. In 1862 the number of passengers in the third-class and parliamentary trains exceeded the number in the second-class by 53,585,242, and exceeded the number in the first-class by 82,349,130. In the same year the receipts from the third-class and parliamentary trains exceeded the receipts from the second-class by 621,029*l.*, and exceeded the receipts from the first-class by 1,306,770*l.*

So far as past statistics of lines that have temporarily lowered their fares, not compelled thereto by virulent competition, and therefore not lowering them by such an inordinate amount, can prove anything, the results are strongly in favour even of the immediate pecuniary benefit of a moderate reduction. The London and North Western were induced, much at the instance of Mr. W. Richardson Roebuck (then the manager of the Stour Valley Railway), to reduce their fares in varying rates of a fourth or fifth of the previous proportions in the district. "The development of traffic," we are told, "was such as to astonish Mr. Roebuck himself and the other local agents and managers, particularly the unwonted development of sparsely populated lines; and these lower fares were, in their opinion, highly remunerative, and would have been more so if the fares had been maintained."

Again, in a paper read at a meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science, Mr. Chadwick mentions, as an instance of the remunerative effect of low fares, that the receipts per train at a penny fare from Shrewsbury to Upton Magna were in December, 1858, 11*l.* 15*s.* 8*d.*; but on the return to a fare of threepence halfpenny in November, 1859, the receipts per train fell to 4*l.* 4*s.* 11*d.* The receipts per train from Shrewsbury to Walcot were, at a penny, 14*l.* 17*s.* 7*d.*, and, at sixpence, they fell in October, 1859, to 4*l.* 5*s.* 5*d.*

These are only adduced as specimens of general statistics, raising a *primâ facie* case in favour of the possible advantage, even to the owners of railways themselves, of a considerable reduction in fares. No doubt this advantage would be far more considerable in some districts than in others, and chiefly so in those parts of the country where travelling is a matter of business with the large masses of trading, labouring, or manufacturing population, rather than of luxurious indulgence and recreation with the wealthy few. Even on the most favourable view of the future, and not reducing the fares lower than to one penny, one half-penny, and one farthing, for the several classes, it might take as much as five years, on an average of all the railways in the country, for the dividends, upon the supposition of any decrease at all, again to reach their present height. It is for this very reason that, inasmuch as no purely commercial corporation can, and no private owners of property will, undergo a possible sacrifice, extending over so long a time, and depending on its ultimate justification upon nothing better than cogent mathematical probabilities, some means must be immediately resorted to of effecting a root-and-branch reformation in the ownership and management of railway property. What means are at hand for carrying out this urgently demanded scheme, what is the best practical mode of at once bringing those means to bear, and what are the real or imaginary obstacles in the way of so doing, we shall shortly have to consider in detail. In the meantime, the radical unsoundness

of the present system viewed abstractedly and disembarrassed from all questions as to the most appropriate remedial scheme, presents yet a further aspect, that is, the one due to the inefficient and disorderly mode of government thereby necessarily entailed.

II. It is an unquestionable property of the existing system of railway management, that it unites in itself all the vices due to indefinite division and want of co-operation, together with all those due to an intimate combination of interests severed from, and most frequently opposed to, the general interests of the community. It is not easy at once to say, still less to predict for the future, whether the country has more to fear from the friendships or from the enmities of railway companies among themselves, whether the more formidable symptoms be their separate weakness or their combined strength.

In the first place, whatever the public may seem to gain by mutual discord in the way of a slight reduction of fares and charges, whatever complacent self-satisfaction the more superficial and short-sighted among them may attempt to extract from a loyal deference to the claims of "free competition," the fallacy of applying this term, by a mere metaphorical use of it, to the case of railways, has been seen to be as patent as it is dangerous. We have already pointed out that, at the time of the first creation of railway property by the legislature, a new modern monopoly, like some child-Hercules, was conjured into life, and, solely with a view to the largest interests and lasting welfare of the nation, the common principles of free competition were absolutely suspended. Wherever, and to what extent soever, these principles have, in the course of railway history, been allowed unfettered play, it has been, not by virtue of their own inherent force and vitality, but solely in furtherance of the self-same objects to secure which alone the monopoly itself was conferred. The end to be reached is, and ever was, the greatest in quantity, the surest in stability, and the longest in duration, of public advantage. The ordinary and normal way to this end, selected and sanctioned by the legislature in the case of railways, has always been, and still is, the insurance of some gain to all at the price of permitting large and disproportionate gains to a few; in other words, the concession of a monopoly. Within certain ill-defined limits, and for supposedly sufficient reasons, the number of sharers in this exclusive boon is from time to time enlarged, those indulged with the new license being selected on a principle somewhat analogous to "free competition." If to this we add a certain amount of fair contention for the public favour on the part of neighbouring or parallel lines, we shall have exhausted every possible occasion on which the notion of "free competition" can be legitimately employed. So far as the principle finds a place in the legal theory of railway property, it is isolated, exceptional, and arbitrarily circumscribed in every direction.

So much for what is not only the legal constitution of our present system, but the only view of it even tolerably conformable to sound policy. It is at once then manifest how anomalous and almost idiotic, were they not so prudently calculated for their end, are the customary arguments in the mouths of companies before Parliamentary committees, as well as the strange conflicts with each other, and still stranger treaties, entered into elsewhere. The old companies are never wearied with harping on their vested rights and incommunicable privileges, thinking little, and caring less, for what sole purpose those rights and privileges were alone conceded, and on what a solemn and precarious tenure they can alone be held. The effect of their persuasions and too potent influence is, that new lines or branches, even of supreme importance to the public good, like that of the Great Eastern, for the purpose of the coal trade, alluded to above, have to be hopelessly abandoned. The new companies come with a different tale, equally false and equally plausible, claiming bills to enable them to construct lines the most improvident and pernicious, in the well-worn name of "free competition." Like evil effects follow, so often as these, too, have their way. The public is not better served, the capital of the country is squandered in unproductive expenditure, the land is alienated and destroyed for ever, and the face of the country in every direction is hideously and needlessly desecrated.

Among the ways in which the complex relations of existing lines among themselves are prejudicial to the public, we may especially notice the habit of guaranteeing dividends by one company to another in order to keep up prices, that of buying up or leasing small lines or portions of lines, and the indefinite capacity for amalgamation. In his evidence before the committee of 1844, Captain Laws especially noticed the power of purchase exercised by railways, and instanced the circumstance of the York and North Midland Company having bought up the Leeds and Selby line, not for the purpose of using it, but for closing it up and taking passengers and goods by a circuitous route on their own line, charging what fares and rates they thought proper. The variation and consequent uncertainty of charges, particularly in the case of goods and packages, is an incalculable evil, and is known to be a great obstacle to their transmission by merchants and others, thereby operating most unfavourably on trade. The want of harmony in the time-tables between opposed companies is a vast inconvenience to travellers going a long distance, and is a proportionate discouragement to travelling such a distance at all. The occasional necessity of changing carriages and the difficulty of fixing officials with their proper responsibility when travelling over several lines, are all petty flaws adherent to the multitudinous systems of government under which a traveller for a long distance must pass, and in their aggregate mount up to considerable mischief.

Notwithstanding, it is less in their rivalry than in their alliances that the true danger lies. There are, in all, seventy or eighty distinct companies in the United Kingdom, of which about thirteen are of giant proportions in relation to the rest. They resemble a number of indepen-

dent political communities, and, as with these, however successfully an artificial "balance of power" may be for a time maintained, there is ever at work a native tendency to congelation and universal empire. In the case of states, there are many reactionary causes at work to put off the day of absorption and consolidation. In the case of railways all influences tend in one and the same direction. Every argument drawn from saving in administrative expense, or from the benefits of mutual insurance against temporary ill-fortune; from availability of a larger capital to promote new undertakings, and assist, throughout a precarious period, old ones; from increased simplicity, and, in fact, from all the considerations we ourselves have repeatedly urged, and shall urge again, tend to one and the same point: the unqualified value of consolidation. And the work is going on around us on every side, and will go on. The Great Eastern, the Midland, the London and North Western, the North Eastern, are all agglutinated masses of heterogeneous atoms, fused together by the glowing fire of keen and intelligent self-interest. Like the modern Prometheus, the nation has manufactured a monster, and it well behoves the nation to recognise its dimensions and measure its power.

The malign influences due to this prodigy are two-fold. Its own interests, so far from being identical with those of the public, are directly antagonistic thereto; and, at whatever points these irreconcileable interests conflict, railway companies are obliged by no sense of responsibility whatever to prefer the general interests of the public to their own. When we speak of the interests of railway companies, it is safer, perhaps, to limit the meaning of the term to their interest as generally interpreted, in fact, by directors, and as most likely to be always interpreted by the overwhelming proportion of ordinary shareholders. In the larger and more precise use of the expression, there is every reason to believe that the interests of companies and of the public are ultimately one.

Now, to show that the apparent interests of the companies and the real interests of the public are in a normal state of internecine strife, we need only call to mind that, with the companies, the primary and most constraining necessity is a return for the capital expended, as large, certain, and as immediate as may possibly be. To this prevailing consideration every other minor object must be imperiously forced to give way. First, the return must be *large* or the *largest*, and hence the accommodation provided must be the least costly the public will tolerate. Wages of labour must be reduced to a minimum, and extended over the smallest possible surface, to secure which the largest amount of work must be extracted, by night and by day, from the smallest number of drivers, pointsmen, signalmen, and guards, no matter how over-wrought their brains and hands, or how frequent the terrific accidents brought about through their jaded incapacity. So far, indeed, as the payment of penalties or damages might tend to diminish profits, there is little enough cause for undue alarm to the shareholders, because the average yearly sum payable on this head admits of being calculated accurately beforehand at only one farthing a mile for every train. Again, as little expenditure as possible can be lavished on increasing the comfort of second-class carriages, on the appropriation of smoking carriages (a want urgently felt by those who smoke and do not smoke alike), on the provision of even tolerable refreshments, on effecting a communication between the guard and driver, so loudly demanded, and on increasing day by day, according to the guidance of experience and invention, the safety and the convenience of travelling. For the same reason, as we said before, a superior advantage of one per cent. or one-half per cent. to the shareholders must be grasped without a moment's hesitation or remorse, whatever the enormous differences in the fares entailed on the travelling public, and whatever the consequences to the general welfare of the whole community.

So, secondly, the returns must be *sure*. No experiment can be tried nor the minutest risk incurred which might hazard a pecuniary loss, however transcendant the possible gain, and however firmly based the grounds for anticipating it. Whether or not existing charges are now fixed at the most remunerative amounts, whether or not an increase in number or variation in time of the trains at present despatched, whether or not new modes of constructing carriages or ensuring punctuality and a more exact correspondence between the different functionaries who regulate the traffic, be practicable and desirable, may be issues of incalculable magnitude to tens of millions of travellers in every year. But there is in every change an indefinite possibility of diminution of profits. The directors, as trustees of an Argus-eyed body of captious shareholders, are compelled to restrict their tentative measures within the narrowest and safest possible compass, and to forego all those ulterior though contingent advantages which form the most appropriate reward of every other commercial undertaking. As before, the permanent welfare and improvement of the many must, perforce, give place to the transitory interests of the few.

And thirdly, the returns must, above all, be *immediate*. Constituted as railway companies are, made up of fluctuating numbers of individuals of all ages, ranks, habits, and degrees of intelligence, the large majority wholly ignorant and careless of the particular concerns of railway management, and even the more critical minority paying only a slight and superficial attention to the details, the sole pledge of prosperity the directors can hold forth is palpable profit, and the only recognisable form of that profit is a quick return to capital invested. This is a further obstacle in the way of lowering fares, even with the most gorgeous and well-assured prospects of adequate remuneration in the not-distant future. The same cause renders the improvement by railways of unoccupied and thinly-populated districts for a short time likely to prove unprofitable, an idle freak of fancy, whose very conception is the notorious brand of quacks and swindlers. The harvest may be a golden one in the future, and assuredly to be

relied on by reference to the laws of nature the most firmly established, but it must be relinquished, unsown and unreaped, seeing that the claims of a few individuals now living are ever to be preferred to those of a whole people living and yet to live.

Such are a few solitary specimens of the eternal conflict waged, as things are, between the interests of the companies and the public. We have said further, that the railway companies are practically exempt from all responsibility, and as they coalesce, through the assiduous process of amalgamation ever going forward, they become more and more so every day. Never has a civilized state generated and embraced in its bosom such an *imperium in imperio* before. Enthroned as the companies are in the imaginations of the vulgar by the colossal magnitude of their operations and the enormous physical energy and unresting industry their very existence implies, their indirect influence is of a kind the most penetrating and irresistible. If to this be added the intimate personal connexion adroitly propagated between the companies and the members of one or both Houses of the legislature, whereby, it is said, 200 directors have seats in the present House of Commons, and also a like connexion existing between the companies and those citizens whose riches are the most abundant, credit most undisputed, and authority most commanding, it requires no eagle's vision to descry, towering up in the midst of the free institutions of Britain, a novel and portentous Power, divorced from the interests, and irresponsible to the sovereignty, of the nation at large. A faculty of unlimited taxation, of imposing arbitrary restrictions and capricious regulations without control, and of impeding, preferring, or completely arresting the national traffic, will recal more than the feudal tyranny of the Middle Ages, with none of its correlating obligations. Surely the nation will watch with a wary eye whither it is floating, and call upon its rulers by a statesmanlike effort to provide, while the opportunity of effecting a contract honourable and beneficial to all parties so prominently offers itself, a single courageous remedy for the multifarious and growing evils of railway rule.

III. It is a favourite truism, repeated again and again by writers in the most respectable daily papers in favour of the existing system of railway ownership and administration, that "people themselves always best manage their own affairs." In the name of this very adage we claim at least an attentive and a patient hearing for a system wholly opposed to that now found amongst us. It is just because none have so deep and prevalent a concern in the economy, the comfort, and the safety of railway travelling as the public at large, that those several ends are more likely to be attained when the instruments of attaining them are in the hands of the whole body, than when in the hands of any section of the whole. To the smaller section these several objects are only valuable as secondary means to the attainment of another primary and incomparable prize, that is, adequate profit on capital invested. To the whole body of the public sufficient remuneration is, indeed, an essential and indispensable condition, but at best it is only a secondary and subordinate means to secure for themselves and their goods what is to them the first and foremost end in view: cheap, easy, and safe carriage from place to place. This being so, it is in the ownership of all railway property by the people, and its management solely on behalf of the people, that the solitary hope of the nation lies. To such readers as are not content supinely to stand aghast at a policy because it is more lordly in its proportions, and based on wider and more farseeing and profounder considerations than the ordinary piecemeal legislation of the hour, we shall proceed to demonstrate that such a transfer from the shareholders to the people is practicable, as we have already endeavoured to show that some such bold reformation cannot be dispensed with.

Now, in order to examine the practicability of such a transfer, it will be convenient to consider in order, first, the legal opportunity that was happily provided twenty-one years ago, by a rare exercise of legislative foresight, and now for the first time is actually offered, of effecting by means of an equitable contract, a complete change of railway ownership and management. The relative situation and existing resources of the two contracting parties will be the next obvious matter of analysis. The terms of the contract that would appear least open to objection from any quarter whatever will then be precisely determined; and lastly, it will be matter of important inquiry what special mode of availing themselves of their new position, if once attained, is most likely to exempt the public from all the vices of the present system, and secure to them inviolate all, and more than all, the indisputable good it contains.

The legal opportunity that now is presented of reforming the railway system was provided by the Act of 1844. That Act was passed, on the urgent recommendation of the late Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Gladstone, by a majority of 186 to 98, and in consequence of the report of a committee of the House of Commons, which examined all the principal directors, managers, and influential or intelligent officials connected with the chief lines in the kingdom. At the time of passing the Act, the whole railway system was an unprecedented and gigantic experiment. Many lines were paying as much as ten per cent. dividends; the people were electrified with pleasure and admiration at the startling results in the way of convenient and rapid travelling so instantaneously produced on every side of them; and, in the face of the exuberant satisfaction of the whole nation, it required more than common honesty, intelligence, and courage to interpose a *veto* to railway usurpation in the name of the people and of those yet unborn. If any one would thoroughly comprehend the spirit of the debate, and the true purport of the Act that resulted from it, he cannot do better than study the speech of Mr. Gladstone at the time, and the report of the committee, together with the evidence adduced before it. "The intention of the bill, was, in the event of the legislature, after a fair trial and proof of the system

then in being, deeming the purchase of railroads by the State politic and expedient, to remove the preliminary bar which exists on the ground of public faith, to leave the question entirely free and open and unfettered by the numerous and complicated considerations which then beset it." The evils that have, in fact, occurred, and are now looming still more ominously in the future, could not then be more than very dimly conceived; but conceived they fortunately were, and railway proprietors were by this Act distinctly and openly warned that, in whatever concessions the nation hereafter made to them, it reserved to itself the plenary right of calculating from time to time the exact measure of those evils, and if need be, of violently shaking itself free from them. A period of twenty-one years, expiring in 1865, was allowed to owners of all lines created in and after 1844, to which alone the Act applied, to develope their system, to approve themselves in the country's eyes, to establish the incomparable claims of an adverse and despotic monopoly, or to stigmatize it in a way nothing but experimental proof could. They have been weighed in the balances, cautiously, patiently, even charitably: and who shall say they have not been found wanting?

The terms of the Act enable the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, if they shall think fit, at any time after the expiration of the term of twenty-one years, to purchase any such railway to which the Act applies in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty, upon giving to the company three calendar months' notice in writing of their intention, and upon payment of a sum equal to twenty-five years' purchase of the annual divisible profit, estimated on the average of the three next preceding years.

Assuming that the proposed contract is actually to be entered upon, that an occasion loudly demanding it has actually arisen, we may go on to review the relative situations and resources of the two parties to the contract. On the one side are the shareholders of all the railways in the kingdom the bills for which were obtained in and after 1844. A few of the companies comprising these shareholders are receiving large dividends, as things now go, that is, to the amount of five and a half, or even six or seven per cent. upon their invested capital; the larger number receiving a more moderate return, and a few receiving no return at all. It may be remarked that, owing to a multitude of causes, such as large and temporary expenditure upon new branches and upon permanent works, alterations in the tariff, the repayment of loans, or commercial and social accidents and variations, it results that the current dividends payable at any given time upon a 100*l.* share form only the roughest, and even sometimes the most misleading criterion of the market value of that share. Hence the error in the Act of 1844 of taking the average annual divisible profits of even so long a period as three years as a basis of valuation. Again, whatever may be the current dividends payable to shareholders, and whatever the market value of their share at any given time, the security for the dividends and that value remaining where they are for so much as five years to come is of the weakest possible description. The degree of this security is different for each line and fluctuating for all lines, even from day to day.

It needs only to watch the vehement animosity and little less than unscrupulous spirit of opposition to all competing claims by which directors are actuated, to measure their sensibility to the causes which may strike at the popularity of their own lines. A shorter and parallel road, easier gradients admitting of heavier trains and cheaper carriage, even speculative schemes never brought to bear, are hostile breezes blowing from every quarter, and ever making the most prosperous lines tremble to their foundations. It is almost pitiful to read the lachrymose and apologetic complaints made by directors, when accounting to their shareholders for past litigation, of the unresting competition that keeps assaulting them on every side. At a late half-yearly meeting, the Chairman of the Midland Company dolorously lamented that, of the new projects before Parliament, about *one hundred* proposed to do something or other with the Midland. Mr. Bidder, a director of the Great Eastern, defended a proposed line which would compete with the Great Northern, on the lugubrious and somewhat vindictive consideration that the latter had invaded the Great Eastern district at Hertford, Cambridge, and Lynn, and they were now trying to get into Norfolk. The chairman of the Great Northern was equally complimentary to the unselfish aggressiveness of the Great Eastern. We may here just notice that this cause of depreciation and insecurity to the value of railway property is entirely due to the fact of the interest in profits being confined to one body, the shareholders, while the power of affecting to any amount these profits is confined to another body, adverse and unsympathizing, the governing public. Were these now incompatible claims and faculties in one and the same hands, the probable effect that every proposed line would have on the moneyed interests of the whole system would assume its due place as a material item of consideration.

We have thus noticed the variability and instability that, from the nature of the case, attaches to all railway property possessed as at present. As to the actual gross amount of capital invested in railways, it came up at the beginning of 1865 to the sum of 425,000,000*l.*, distributed between ordinary capital, preferential capital, and loans. The nett returns for 1863 yielded on the whole invested capital within a small fraction of four per cent. There is reason to suppose that the nett returns for last year would be about four and a half per cent. Investors can purchase at a rate which will pay them five per cent., and inasmuch as the ordinary capital is over 215,000,000*l.*, the market value of this at four and a half per cent. interest will be 194,000,000*l.* So much for the position, expectations, and property of one party to the proposed contract, the shareholders. The question next to be answered is, what sort of return can the public give as a fair and reasonable price for the transfer?

In the first place, the public, acting through the legislature, can give security, the highest and most unexceptionable known in the mer-

cantile world,—security only limited by the character, the strength, and the longevity of the nation itself. It can at once relieve the shareholders from a situation we have seen to be full of disquietude and well-grounded embarrassment, even, it may be, of future insolvency and ruin. The public can further secure for ever to the shareholders a fairly compensating annuity, calculated upon the average value of their expectations, and also upon a correct estimation of the improved value of the new security with which it is accompanied. It can further give a bonus upon every share transferred to itself, sufficient to induce the holder, not only to acquiesce in, but to welcome and desire the exchange.

Such being the general capacities of the parties, next, as to the precise terms of the contract. There are many grounds for excluding from consideration the specific suggestions contained in the Act of 1844. They are merely suggestions which, however valuable they had been, would in no case have been acted upon without fresh recurrence to legislation, and they are, in fact, open to many critical objections. The two main questions are, What is a fair price to give? and, Where is the money to come from?

Now, for the sake of adopting some definite figures, certainly not less, and perhaps not much more, than what would give satisfaction to both parties, we shall name the sums suggested by Mr. Galt, that is fifteen per cent. on the market value of an original share, and four or five per cent. on loans and preferential capital, as a suitable bonus to be paid to shareholders on the exchange of every railway share or loan of 100*l.* for 100*l.* Government stock, and, taking into account the vastly-increased security, consider three and a half per cent. interest on every 100*l.* stock as an equitable yearly payment to the shareholders, in lieu of the dividends previously received. Thus the market value of the original shares was seen to amount to 194,000,000*l.* The bonus on this, calculated as above, would be 29,000,000*l.* The preference or guaranteed capital or loans was 210,000,000*l.*, and the corresponding bonus would be 10,000,000*l.* Thus the total price to be paid would be 443,000,000*l.* If this payment were made by the assignment of newly-created stock, bearing interest at three and a half per cent., the yearly payments by the nation to the shareholders would be 15,500,000*l.* We shall shortly arrive at the same price from another point of departure.

Now there meet us at this stage two classes of alarmists, who have to be separately dismissed. The first class are of an imaginative cast, and stand simply aghast at what they choose to call "adding 400,000,000*l.* to the national debt." The ideas of these good people are in such a state of honest confusion and self-contradiction that it is not easy to know where to have them. They have probably a kind of hazy notion that the operation recommended is equivalent to lavishing vast sums at once in unproductive expenditure, and likely to have something the same effect as a hotly-contested European war, lasting for several years, and with England at the head of it. Well may our narrow conceptions of all political subjects suggest to foreigners that we have learnt them behind the counter. It is perhaps scarcely worth while dissipating these clouds of misconception by noticing that the so-called creation of public debt in all cases whatever is nothing more than a convenient political fiction to express in metaphorical terms the perpetual liability incurred by the State to pay an annuity of such and such an amount to the so-called proprietors of that stock, until the liability be redeemed by the payment of money exactly and nominally equivalent to the stock described. The usual legal consideration for granting such an annuity is the advance of a quantity of cash to pay the wages of soldiers, sailors, and the like, and to build ships and carry on expensive wars. In the present case the consideration is the transfer of ownership in railways, and of all the rights to receive the profits accruing therefrom, and to interfere in their management. To suit these morbid minds, the new stock might be kept quite distinct from the old, denominated by a new name, and the interest made conspicuously payable, in the first place, out of railway profits.

The other class of objectors are nervously apprehensive of the effect on the money market of a sudden and convulsive opening out of four hundred millions' worth of new stock. Now the whole force of this obstacle is enclosed in the gratuitous use of the words "sudden" and "convulsive." Nothing has been said by the advocates of this measure to prevent the operation of transfer being gradual and cautious, waiting partly on the disposition of companies to close with the tender on terms agreeable to both sides, partly on the actual state of the money market being such, that Government security, to the amount of the price agreed upon, at three and a half per cent., presents sufficient attractions to favour the completion of the contract. It is extremely desirable that, if possible, the proposed measure should not be forced on shareholders and directors, but that they should meet it half way; and, with this view, the measure must be carried out slowly and tentatively. There are only two ways in which the money market can be convulsively and injuriously affected: one by a sudden appearance or disengagement of capital in search of investment, the other by a sudden birth of new schemes demanding capital and presenting hopeful prospects of profitable returns. Taking in the whole means of investment throughout the country, neither one nor the other of these influences can in any way be set at work by the mere gradual exchange of securities, as between the shareholders and the public, here advocated. It will not of itself set free a farthing of money now invested, nor open out a single avenue for new investment which did not, in one form or other, exist before.

Now, having disposed of these two classes of irrelevant objectors, we may approach the consideration of what seem to be the most equitable terms of the contract from a different point of view. The sum paid by the public to railway companies in the year 1864, in the

way of fares and charges, amounted to 31,156,397*l.* The average annual cost of management is about 15,000,000*l.* Thus the actual annual sum to be made good to the shareholders, or else to be redeemed by some sufficient compensation, is about 16,000,000*l.* Now, if the system in all its detail of high fares, charges, and the rest, were maintained as it at present exists, the mere trusteeship and responsibility of management being made over to the State, the same profits would satisfy the same dividends, and the difference would be to the old shareholders, only that due to fresh security enormously surpassing in strength the old, and to the public that due to whatever saving was effected by an uniform administration and a more cautious admission of competing lines. But the very object of the proposed transfer being that henceforth the cheapness, safety, and comfort of travelling be the first consideration, and a reproductive investment only the second and ever subordinate one, we must provide in our estimate against the possibility of an immediate pecuniary loss, in consequence of the lowering of fares and charges. We have seen that such a loss does sometimes follow temporary changes in fares, and, in what may prove ultimately the most profitable districts, the loss may at first be most conspicuous. Thus it is safer to anticipate that, during the first few years of the change, the loss yearly may, as in the parallel case of the Post-office reform, amount to some considerable sum. We shall not be charged with extenuating it unfairly if we name 5,000,000*l.* as the conceivable loss every year on such a reduction of fares and charges as shall bestow what is, perhaps, the largest amount of benefit upon the greatest number of the population. Now, in order to make up this sum to the public, we can set off against it at least (say) 2,000,000*l.*, to be saved by the simplified mode of organization the new ownership involves. The remaining 3,000,000*l.* is fairly to be deducted from the yearly payments due to the shareholders on account of the additional security imparted to their claims. The average difference of interest, apart from the value of the security, arising from the investment of 100*l.* in Government and railway stock, is 1*l.* 10*s.* Supposing, under the new system, this sum accruing from every 100*l.* of invested railway capital be equally divided between the new and the old owners, who both have their special claims to part of it, the whole value yearly payable to each, that is to say, three-fourths per cent. on all the railway property in the kingdom, valued at 400,000,000*l.*, will be just 3,000,000*l.*, the sum of which we were in quest.

Now, it is important to notice that the two calculations we have made exactly tally with each other. We have approached the question of terms from both sides, that of the buyer and that of the seller; and, so far as the rough statistics at present ready to our use admit of our forming an estimate, we have found the fair and reasonable price to be the same. From the point of view of the buyer, or the public, we saw that an equitable price would be the creation, in favour of the shareholders, of new stock to the amount of 443,000,000*l.*, with interest accruing at three and a half per cent. The yearly sum thus payable by the public to the shareholders would amount to 15,500,000*l.* From the other point of view, that of the shareholder, we have just seen that, whereas the actual value of dividends, calculated at their present worth, of which they would be deprived, would be something over 16,000,000*l.*, yet, in consideration of highly improved security, a yearly payment of considerably less than this sum would be amply sufficient by way of compensation.

A great deal of confused thought has struggled for expression to the prejudice of calm deliberation on this subject, on the alleged ground that Government is notoriously unfitted to manage any large concern partaking of a commercial character. It is wanting in the requisite machinery, and it has neither the energy, the skill, nor integrity to use well the machinery that might be put into its hands. A few unequivocal facts will readily clear away these mists.

We have already noticed that the time is coming, and is already partially come, when the whole railway system must and will be submitted to the management of either one sole corporate body, or to a very limited number of such bodies. The pressing question is, whether, inasmuch as this prospective amalgamation is an inexorable necessity that cannot be eluded, the direction of so complex and gigantic a system shall be undertaken for the people or against the people? It must be regulated with a primary view either to the largest remuneration of a few, or to the convenience and social welfare of all. Competition, acting according to its natural laws, and forcibly blending these two ends in one, is here reduced to the narrowest limits, and in the long run is signally inoperative. It is only from a body constituted out of themselves, directly responsible to themselves step by step, and removable and alterable at their own arbitrary will, that the people can look for a keen preference of the national interests to all minor ends. It evinces much ignorance and inconsiderateness to urge that the Government, as such, is unfitted to engage in concerns of this nature by the very conditions of its being. In the first place, the reform here advocated does not imply of itself any change whatever in the directorate or the trusteeship of railways, but only a substitution of the whole nation in the place of a limited body of shareholders, or, in legal language, of one set of *cestui qui* trusts for another. It is a familiar enough idea in all other undertakings that subordinate workmen may be induced to work to the highest amount of efficiency by identifying, through some temporary arrangement, their interests with their success. All contracts and sub-contracts for architectural and other works, among which are those for large Government works, offices, dock-yards, forts, barracks, ships of war, and the like, are conducted on this invariable principle, and whatever omissions or neglects may creep into the details, the principle itself is unassailably strong.

Now it will only be necessary to allude cursorily to some of the obvious methods of regulating railways, in the event of their purchase by the State, without descending into minute details. There is first, the method of leasing them out, either to the present or to new companies, the lessees being selected on the principles of free competition. The companies contracting to manage the lines would derive their remuneration either from a fixed percentage on the gross returns, or by means of being allowed to reserve to themselves a fixed sum for every mile of the line. The main point here demanding attention would be the insertion of stringent covenants to repair in every contract of lease, and a scrutinizing valuation of all the rolling stock of the railway on every change of tenants. This method is specially applicable to the construction of new lines. Again, there is the method, specially favoured by Mr. Galt, of having all the lines throughout the country managed by a Central Board, which might be formed of the most experienced members of present railway boards, and represent in fit proportions all the existing companies. This would secure men specially acquainted with the peculiar situation and wants of all the lines. They might be presided over by a Minister of State, with a seat in the Cabinet, who, of course, would be changed with the Ministry. This would in some way assimilate the Railway Board to the Indian Board, the Board of Trade, and the Poor Law Board. Or, the president might be a permanent and irremovable officer, resembling the chiefs of departments in Somerset House. If to either of these last schemes it be objected that the Government patronage would be alarmingly increased, it is answered that the appointment of innumerable subordinates must rest in some hands or other—that, in the probable and more and more impending event of general amalgamation of companies under the present rule, a system of patronage will be generated far more capricious and arbitrary, because totally irresponsible, than any that could possibly grow up under the auspices of a government so constituted as ours. Indeed, already the larger and larger diffusion of competitive and educational tests, and the rapidly-advancing belief in their unapproachable value, are rendering obsolete this venerable outlet for political recriminations.

We have said nothing hitherto upon the subject of railway systems as they exist in other lands. The only case that could be strictly serviceable for our purpose would be that of a country having tried both the conflicting systems in their entirety, one after another. But no such precedent is to be found. The modes of railway ownership and management abroad are either mixed and fluctuating from year to year, as in France, and even from one line to another, as in Prussia, or extend over a very small area, as in Belgium, so that almost any conclusion whatever might be supported by a partial and one-sided reference to any one of these countries. Certainly it must be confessed by all competent observers, that a superficial view of foreign modes of administration, whether on the score of cheapness, comfort, or safety, gives a result vastly preponderating in their favour as compared with ours. The true gist of the whole problem was firmly grasped by M. Rogier, the Minister of Finance in Belgium, when the project of constructing State railways was first introduced into the Belgian Chambers in 1834. "No," said M. Rogier, "the state of affairs in which competition corrects the evil does not apply here: whoever holds the railways holds a monopoly, and that should only be allowed to exist in the possession of the State, subject to the responsible advisers of the Crown."

We have thus explored in detail all the evils that tenaciously adhere, and cannot but adhere, to the existing system of railway ownership and administration in England. We have gone on to describe, with full particularity, that special mode of reconstruction which is implied in the so-called purchase of railways by the State. The practicability of such purchase has been, it is submitted, adequately demonstrated, while the objections to carrying it out in fact have been fairly met, and in every case conclusively set aside. Apart, however, from such partial exceptions to particular aspects of the scheme in view, there remain still to be encountered two important classes of fundamental objections which strike at the very root of the whole mode of remedy here insisted on. These two sources of disinclination to entertain the new conception, even in thought, are due to two several courses of thought, equally popular and equally false. The one is an ignorant and irrational distaste to what is termed "centralization;" the other is a kind of moral reluctance to interfere arbitrarily with the property of railway companies in land.

If we were at present engaged in an historical analysis of complex ideas, with all their current associations, no more interesting subject of experiment could be laid hold of than the complex notion usually present on the use of the term "centralization." The simpler ideas that go to form the complex whole are constructed in part out of observations, generally most inexact, of what exists in neighbouring countries, in part out of the magnified image presented by an alarmed imagination. The annihilation of all local and subordinate authority, together with those habits of self-reliance and independence such authority best tends to foster; capricious interference on the part of ill-informed officials far from the spot at every stage in the actions of those beneath them; the remote responsibility incurred by the governing body and the opportunities for a despotic use of their power—such conglomerate ideas form only a portion of the terrific phantasm conjured up by the use of the term "centralization." Under some constitutions of the State, and in the case of some departments of government, it is undeniable that such mischiefs as these may, and do really, exist, where all local and independent authorities are needlessly superseded. But in the case of railways, under such a constitution as that of England, all thought of such calamities is irrelevant and absurd. From the very nature of locomotion, which is implied from first to last, all local, partial, and

particular claims are merged in the universal interests of the whole community everywhere present. It is the country at large, and not a special district of it, that has the deepest concern in ever so minute a branch of railway by which that district is traversed. So long as the House of Commons continues to maintain an effective check on ministerial administration, the responsibility of managers under a centralized system would far exceed anything hitherto known or conceived. As representation in that House becomes more complete, it will be more and more the people alone, and no bureaucratic coterie, as the objection suggests, who will regulate, punish, and reward. All the possible vices of centralization being here away, all the conspicuous advantages of that method of government will be present in the largest possible measure, inasmuch as no undertaking can gain so inordinately as that of railways by the use of combined intelligence, ready co-operation, economic service, and unity of administration.

The last form of general objection rests upon ground which is becoming day by day more demonstrably untenable. It is being seen with ever-increasing and more and more convincing clearness that, in a country like England, whose population is constantly swelling up to the brim, the means of living at all, and then the ways of living not quite despicably, are becoming the first and most engrossing cares of the State. No narrow individual interest, be it ever so plausible or ever so antique, will be able long to hold its ground in the face of a crushed and suffering population. To distribute the land of the rich among the poor and rich would be unjust, only because it would be unserviceable, and just because it would be palpably unserviceable, the dream of doing so is rightly abandoned to charlatans and traitors. But for the State to ignore decisively the existence anywhere out of itself of absolute property in the national soil, and to resist the silent and slowly progressive invasion of what once were, and ever should be held, the indefeasible rights of all in every part, is nothing else than policy the most honourable and the most sound. It is due far more to public causes and national accidents than to the labours of proprietors, that the produce of land, and therefore land itself, has increased so exorbitantly in value and demand. What the State alone must thus be taken to have conditionally given, the State can, in all reason, on making fair compensation in another form, and on sufficient cause shown, take away. It is confessed in our daily policy and even in our law, however reluctantly in some quarters the theory may be conceded, that neither individual landowners nor corporate bodies can hold land otherwise than as transitory tenants of the State. The more clearly this doctrine is recognised and the more openly it is avowed, the nation will address itself to grapple with the special problems of legislation affecting land, as they from time to time present themselves, with all the more serene intelligence and the more unflinching courage.

ART. II.—THE ROYAL HOSPITAL OF BETHLEHEM.

1. *Report, together with the Minutes of Evidence, and an Appendix of Papers, from the Committee appointed to Consider of Provision being made for the Better Regulation of Madhouses in England.* (Ordered by the House of Commons to be Printed, July 11th, 1815.)
2. *Return to an Address of the House of Lords for Copies of all Reports of the Commissioners in Lunacy, and the Evidence presented by them to the Home Office as to the State and Management of Bethlehem Hospital, and of all Correspondence thereon; and of the Observations of the Governors of Bethlehem Hospital on the Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Secretary of State.* (Ordered to be Printed, March 15th, 1853.)
3. *Report of the Charity Commissioners on Bethlehem Hospital.* Parliamentary Paper, 382. 1865.
4. *Annual Report of the Royal Hospitals of Bridewell and Bethlehem for the year* 1864.

WHOSOEVER aspires to effect some great reform in any department of human thought or action, whether moved thereto by a laudable ambition, or inspired by humane feeling, should not look back only to the lofty height on which in the distant past stands the great reformer, and hope that he may reach an equal height of glory in his day and generation, but should rather look abroad and scan the dreary prosaic events in which he is living; should mark well the scarce perceptible motion of any current of progress in the face of interested prejudice and ignorant opposition; and should not fail soberly to reflect how little is thought of him who is spending the energy and sacrificing the comfort of a life in doing good to the world in spite of itself. Then, if he still hold fast to his benevolent aim, let him in firm resolve and with patient endurance, without illusion and without exultation, nerve himself to enter upon a thorny and uncertain path, on which it may be that he will have to sink down and fail. Not only petty jealousies, irritated prejudice, offended self-interest, malignant envy, and all the host of evil passions that go to strengthen the great army of obstructiveness, will be found arrayed in hostile line against the champion of progress; but his bitterest sorrow will be to find himself opposed and misunderstood by many whom he knows to be well-meaning and sincere, but who cannot conceive of other and better things than those to which they have been accustomed. Such men unconsciously become a part of the system in which they have lived and to which they have grown; they move contentedly in the old ruts, and only that which has been is with them that which shall be. Any one starting forth on a new path, with unfamiliar aspirations appears to them as a madman, or a self-seeking schemer, or at best a phenomenon utterly unintelligible, but of which they entertain the sincerest distrust, while they are the most formidable enemies of the reformer, because they are conscientiously so, and because they are in the closest sympathy with the stag-

nation which he labours to abolish. Throughout all time it has been so, and to the end of time it must, by the nature of things, be so; in one way or another the reformer is despised and rejected of men—a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief. When not actively opposed and openly reviled, his work is not seldom being done while men wist not of it — while they hide, as it were, their faces from him; and it is commonly completed, and the self-sacrifice of his life over, before the world awakens to anything like an adequate consciousness of its vast importance. Often, too, it happens that he survives not to behold any fruit of his labours—has only a glimpse of the promised land; and, like Moses of old, lies down to die in solitary sorrow on some lonely Pisgah, while others joyously gather in the harvest which he has sown with much painful toil. And when they have gathered in the fruits, they slowly call to mind him who has been their benefactor, place him on a pedestal of glory amongst the great ones of the past, and determine with one consent that his name shall live for evermore. Having paid which debt of gratitude to the past, they proceed forthwith to resist the reformer who is living and labouring among them, and with all their might strive to crush him out.

The cost to the individual reformer being so severe, and the strength required of him so great, even when the rare opportunity offers, it is no wonder that there are many who refuse to become martyrs in the cause of humanity; that there are others who break down in the unequal conflict; and that but few centuries have a great reform to boast of. How many years has man lived upon earth, and how few has he profitably employed! It may not be amiss, then, that the present century, in which a great social reform has been accomplished by the labours of a few men, should be reminded of the noble work that has been done, and called to take some thought of the difficulties that have been patiently surmounted, and of the vast gain that has accrued to humanity. Familiarity with the modern and scientific treatment of the insane is apt to make us forget that it is of quite recent birth, and that within the memory of many now living it would have been thought the wildest madness to dream of dealing with these afflicted beings otherwise than as with the most dangerous animals. Not in any country nor at any period before this century, was there a just conception of the insane as victims of disease, whom it was necessary to treat as such, and of mental derangement as the perverted function of a diseased organ; and even at the present time this conception has not gained full admission into the mind of every legislator, or of the general public. Happily, mankind is capable of being moved through feeling to a practical course, the theory of which it does not fully appreciate. This was what happened in regard to the insane. The horrible revelations of their miserable condition aroused public compassion, and there were found men of humane feelings and enlightened views sufficiently far-seeing, patient, resolute, and energetic to realize the better feelings in a better system of treatment. It is now the fixed habit in this country to treat the insane as sufferers from disease, and it is not deemed necessary or thought right to apply any sort of mechanical restraint even to the most excited maniac. Such a vast reform has been accomplished in our time by the labours of a few determined men, and some of them who were leaders in the fight are still living, strangely unregarded, and entirely unrewarded, by an age which owes them so much. We propose now, then, to exhibit the course of progress from the old and barbarous system of chaining up the insane, to the modern humane and enlightened system of treatment; to point out through what difficulties the advance was made, and to indicate, as far as it is yet visible, the path of future progress. To this end it will be most convenient to take the history of Bethlehem Hospital, the management, or more correctly the mismanagement, of which has, at different times within the last fifty years, been the subject of special inquiry by a committee of the House of Commons, by the Lunacy Commissioners, and twice by the Charity Commissioners. It has been the last stronghold of an obstructive policy, and the congenial home of the worst iniquities of an iniquitous system, with which through all time to come its history will be identified; for, as truly said in the House of Commons, if ever any public establishment has covered England with shame, it is Bethlehem Hospital. The periodical public interference which has been necessary in order to bring this hospital up to the level of similar institutions, has resulted in certain reports, enumerated at the head of this article, that are now valuable records; in them we witness the gradual breaking down of the old system of barbarity and obstructiveness under the pressure of enlightened opinion brought to bear from without; and they are thus trustworthy landmarks on the road, by help of which we are enabled to realize how fearfully bad the old system was, how difficult was its destruction, and how great has been the progress.

Before proceeding to elicit from these reports the history of the destruction of the old, and the growth of the new, system of treating Insanity, it may be well to give a brief sketch of the manner of dealing with the insane at different times and in different countries, in order to show how entirely new the modern scientific system really is. By the Eastern nations, generally, it would appear that the insane were regarded, according to the manner of their madness, either as inspired by some divine spirit, and then consulted as oracles, or as possessed with some evil spirit, and avoided as having a devil in them. As in the different powers of nature good or evil spirits were supposed to reign, according as their influence was beneficial, or appeared malignant, so in the unaccountable perversion of human nature displayed in the vagaries of insanity, men saw the good or the evil spirit, according as these were harmless or offensive. In the latter case, it was often supposed that so great a degradation must proceed from divine anger, and be a punishment inflicted by divine agency. It can

scarcely admit of doubt, however, that many insane must have suffered a violent death, in accordance with the prevailing law of vengeance which ordained an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; for it is the nature of insanity to rebel against and to outrage the established laws and customs of society, and on any such crime the Mosaic laws would press most severely. The ancient Egyptians—a wonderful people in many regards—seem to have arrived at a far more just conception of the nature of insanity than other nations at that time; for they had at both extremities of Egypt temples, surrounded by shady groves and beautiful gardens, to which melancholics in great numbers resorted in quest of relief, and in which varieties of games and recreations were established for the amusement of the mind and the invigoration of the body, while the imagination was impressed with the finest productions of the sculptor and the painter. Perhaps it was in Egypt that Pythagoras, the first Greek philosopher who practised medicine, learned this plan of treating insanity, afterwards introducing it, along with the doctrine of metempsychosis, into Greece. At any rate, Asclepiades, who is said to be the founder of a moral treatment of insanity among the Greeks, adopted a humane and rational system: music, love, wine, employment, exercising the memory, and fixing the attention, were his principal remedies; and he recommended that bodily restraint should be avoided as much as possible, and that none but the most violent should be bound. The theory of the supernatural origin of the madness of Orestes proves, however, that the Greeks generally had very erroneous notions of its nature as a disease, and of the mode of its causation.

Hippocrates was undoubtedly the first to recognise the true nature of insanity; he clearly perceived that the brain was the organ affected, and that there was nothing more divine in one disease than another. *Ἐμοὶ δὲ καὶ ἀντέῳ δοκέει τῦντα τὰ πάθεα θεῖα εἶναι καὶ τἄλλα πάντα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἑτέρου θειότερον οὐδὲ ἀνθρωπινώτερον ἀλλὰ πάντα θεῖα.* And if we are to believe genuine the account given of the interview between him and Democritus, it is impossible to esteem too highly his diagnostic power. The people of Abdera, thinking Democritus to be mad, because of his strange behaviour, sent for Hippocrates, in order that he might give them his opinion, and, if needful, exercise his skill upon the laughing philosopher. "When Hippocrates was come to Abdera, the people of the city came flocking about him, some weeping, some entreating of him that he would do his best. After some little repast, he went to see Democritus, the people following him, whom he found in his garden in the suburbs, all alone, sitting upon a stone under a plane tree, without hose or shoes, with a book on his knees, cutting up several beasts, and busy at his study. The multitude stood gazing round about to see the congress. Hippocrates, after a little pause, saluted him, whom he re-saluted, ashamed almost that he could not call him likewise by his name, or that he had forgot it." Thereupon ensues a long discourse, in which Democritus gives excellent reasons for his singular behaviour, and shows satisfactorily that he has good cause to laugh at the miseries, the madness, and the follies of mankind. "It grew late: Hippocrates left him; and no sooner was he come away, but all the citizens came about flocking to know how he liked him. He told them in brief that, notwithstanding these small neglects of his attire, body, diet, the world had not a wiser, a more learned, a more honest man; and they were much deceived to say that he was mad." It is plain that Hippocrates knew better than many modern physicians how to distinguish between eccentricity and disease. More explicit views respecting the different ways in which the brain was affected in insanity were enunciated by Galen, who, indeed, has made many admirable observations, still instructive and worthy to be had in remembrance. Indeed, it is a matter of wonder that they should ever have been so completely forgotten, as they unquestionably were.

In the middle ages, under the blighting influence of an ignorant and intolerant priesthood, all rational views of the nature of insanity seem to have perished. There was a return to primeval superstition and to a barbarous treatment. If the poor madman were orthodox in his ravings, and capable of being used for the promotion of the interests of the Church, he was canonized like St. Francis, the founder of the Franciscans, who loved to strip himself naked, and to dress himself fantastically, who saw visions, and who was chained down in a dark room as a madman by his own parents. Another saint, St. Rosa de Luna, mixed gall and fæces with all her food, in token of humility and by way of penance; Agnes de Jesus, with like humility, refused to destroy the vermin which swarmed in her hair; St. Catherine of Sienna believed that she was received as a veritable spouse into the bosom of the Saviour; and St. Theresa not unfrequently reproached herself that her nightly raptures and salacious ecstasies were not sufficiently free from voluptuous bodily feelings. On the other hand, if the manifestations of insanity took a heterodox form, it went hard with the sufferers, numbers of whom were burnt alive as atheists or heretics, or as having had converse with the devil. Meanwhile it is probable that the insane, who were harmless, wandered about the country living on the charity of people and of the monasteries; and there can be no doubt that many of those who committed violence suffered as ordinary criminals. There was no conception of insanity as a disease demanding, like other diseases, medical treatment: the light which Hippocrates and Galen had thrown upon it was completely extinguished.

It was in 1547 that Henry VIII. granted to the City of London the suppressed priory of St. Mary of Bethlehem, which had been founded in 1246 by one of the Sheriffs of London, "to make there a priory, and to ordain a prior and canons, brothers, and also sisters, when Jesus Christ shall enlarge his grace upon it;" and "for to say divine service there for the souls aforesaid, and all Christian souls." This house the City of London converted into a

hospital for the reception of lunatics, thus founding the first hospital in England specially devoted to the reception of persons of unsound mind. It stood in Bishopsgate ward, without the city wall, where now is Bethlem Court off Bishopsgate-street, "in an obscure and close place," says Stowe, "near unto many common sewers, and also was too little to receive and entertain the great number of distracted persons, both men and women." Accordingly, in 1675, the second Bethlehem Hospital was built in Moorfields, a stately and magnificent structure, with gardens before it. "And besides the garden, there is at each end another for the lunatic people to walk in for their refreshment, when they are a little well of their distemper; and that part fronting the fields hath iron gates in several places of the wall, to the end that passengers as they walk in the fields may look into the garden. This large fabric is built of brick and freestone; the gate, or entrance, all of stone, with two figures of a distracted man and woman over the gate." The eighth picture in Hogarth's "Rake's Progress," which was painted in 1735, is evidently founded on observations made in the wards of this Bedlam, and may serve to convey some idea of the scenes in it. The rake, his face wrung with the last strain of human suffering, lies dying in the arms of the poor weeping woman whom he had seduced, his ankles loaded with chains, and the physician leaning over him; in one of the cells is seen a naked figure on a straw bed, the chains round his wrists hanging over the bedstead; in another cell sits a crowned figure, and a mad astronomer occupies the centre of the picture. These miserable creatures, chained on their straw, were made objects of exhibition to the idle and the curious, just as the lions in the Tower were. One of the entries in Mr. Pepys' Diary is:—"Stept into Bedlam, where I saw several poor miserable creatures in chains; one of them was mad with making verses." Steele, again, in the "Tatler," mentions how he paid a visit to Bedlam with several friends, in order to show them the sights there. No cruelty, however extreme, but what familiarity will divest of its horrors, blunting the feelings of the most humane, and obscuring the judgment of the most enlightened of men.

Thus cruelly things went on year after year, until 1815, in spite of the occasional protest of some benovolent person who was horrified with the painful scenes that he had witnessed. Words cannot express, nor mind conceive, the countless cruelties practised within the walls of old Bedlam—cruelties such as would righteously cover with eternal infamy those who were in any way responsible for them, were it not that their names are, happily, for the most part buried in oblivion. And yet the governors of this wealthy charity could have had no interest and no pleasure in its mismanagement; they gave their services without recompense, and no doubt conscientiously; and they sincerely resented the suggestion of public interference. It is ever so; more suffering is caused in the world by want of thought and by obstructive prejudice than by heartlessness and wilful design. For the Bethlehem system was not at that time general; it had been superseded by that more enlightened and humane system, which receiving its first impulse from the great uprising of outraged human feeling in the French revolution, had been initiated by Pinel in France, further developed by Esquirol, and carried into admirable operation at the "Quakers' Retreat," near York.

At last the troublesome reformer, so offensive to official indolence, and to hostile iniquities, though hallowed by age, appeared, and in spite of opposition, forced his way into Bethlehem Hospital. Mr. Edward Wakefield, who for many years had been in the habit of visiting all places where insane persons were confined, first visited the hospital on April 25th, 1814, and made another visit on May 2nd. What he found on these occasions is recorded in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons. In the women's galleries, one of the side rooms contained about ten patients, each chained by one arm or leg to the wall, the chain allowing them merely to stand up by the bench or form fixed to the wall, or to sit down on it. The nakedness of each patient was covered by a blanket, made into something like a dressing-gown, but with nothing to fasten it in front. This was the whole covering, the feet being naked. In another part he found many of the unfortunate women locked up in their cells, naked, and chained on straw, with only one blanket for a covering. In the men's wing, in the side room, six patients were chained close to the wall, five handcuffed, and one locked to the wall by the right arm, as well as by the right leg; he was very noisy; all were naked except as to the blanket-gown or small rug on the shoulders, and without shoes—their nakedness and their mode of confinement gave this room the complete appearance of a dog-kennel.

"In one of the cells on the lower gallery we saw William Norris. He stated himself to be 55 years of age, and that he had been confined about 14 years; that in consequence of attempting to defend himself from what he conceived the improper treatment of his keeper, he was fastened by a long chain, which, passing through a partition, enabled the keeper, by going into the next cell, to draw him close to the wall at pleasure; that to prevent this, Norris muffled the chain with straw, so as to hinder it passing through the wall: that he afterwards was confined in the manner we saw him, namely, a stout iron ring was rivetted round his neck, from which a short chain passed to a ring made to slide upwards and downwards, on an upright massive iron bar, more than six feet high, inserted into the wall; round his body a strong iron bar, about two inches, wide, was rivetted: on each side the bar was a circular projection, which, being fastened to and enclosing each of his arms, pinioned them close to his sides. This waist-bar was secured by two similar bars, which, passing over his shoulders, were rivetted to the waist-bar, both before and behind. The iron ring round his neck was connected to the bars on his shoulders by a double link; from each of these bars another short chain passed to the ring on the upright bar. We were informed he was enabled to raise himself so as to stand against the wall on the pillow of his bed in the trough bed in which he

lay; but it is impossible for him to advance from the wall in which the iron bar is soldered, on account of the shortness of the chains, which were only twelve inches long. It was, I conceive, equally out of his power to repose in any other position than on his back, the projections on each side of the waist-bar enclosed his arms, rendering it impossible for him to lie on his side, even if the length of the chain from his neck and shoulders would permit it. His right leg was chained to the trough, in which he had remained thus encaged and chained for more than twelve years."

A marvellous example truly of what the human constitution may accommodate itself to! Poor Norris was not released from this confinement until about three weeks or a month before his death, which, notwithstanding the opinion of Dr. Monro, the physician then at the head of the medical department, may well be thought to have been hastened by the treatment to which he was subjected. That gentleman being asked whether he did not think that the pulmonary complaint of which Norris died might have been produced by the great quantity of iron he wore for so many years? replied, "I think not." Again asked:—

"'Do you think a person could have had about him a weight of iron, say six or eight-and-twenty pounds; that he could have been confined to his bed without being allowed to turn round for nine years, or without being able to get out and sit on the edge of his bed, being chained by the head by a chain only twelve inches from the iron stanchion, and that would have no effect upon his general health?'—'It did not appear to have any general effect upon his health—he was in very good health till within a very short period of his death.'"

The apothecary coincided in his colleague's opinion, and even became enthusiastic about the excellence of restraint by means of irons. In reply to a question, he asserted that to secure the patient with irons was a thousand times less objectionable than the strait-waistcoat, and that, footlocked and manacled, he was rendered an "innoxious animal."

It was revealed furthermore, by the examination of Dr. Monro, that it was the custom at particular seasons of the year, May, June, July, August, and September, "to apply general bleeding, purging, and vomit," without any discrimination of cases. It was asked whether the bleeding and vomiting were performed at the same period, or periodically, like the other modes of treatment, and the reply was—"They are ordered to be bled about the latter end of May, or the beginning of May, according to the weather; and after they have been bled they take vomits once a week for a number of weeks; after that we purge the patients; that has been the practice invariably for years, long before my time; it was handed down to me by my father, and I do not know any better practice." Besides the acknowledgment and approval of this remarkable system of medical treatment, the investigations of the Committee elicited the disgraceful and almost incredible fact that a male keeper was employed to attend to the refractory female patients. Certainly Dr. Monro could not give satisfactory answers upon this point, though much pressed, and could not recollect that the Chamberlain of the City of London had interfered and dismissed a certain male keeper named King; but the evidence of the apothecary, who was thereupon re-called and re-examined, leaves no doubt that this abominable practice was the regular custom of the hospital.

"'Was not a man appointed to do the duty of keeper to the women only?'—'That has always been the case.' 'Do you remember a keeper of the name of King?'—'Perfectly.' 'Was not King, when keeper of the female patients, charged with being too familiar with a female patient of great beauty?'—'The patient herself did charge him with that.' 'He being keeper of the female patients at the time?'—'Yes, she complained to me of it.' 'Did not the Governors, from learning that fact, direct that no man should again be put as keeper of the women?'—'I do not recollect that they came to any resolution upon that case; it was about three years ago. Some years ago, a female patient had been impregnated twice during the time she was in the hospital; at one time she miscarried; and the person who was proved to have had connexion with her, being a keeper, was accordingly discharged.'"

It was too plain, as the examination by the House of Commons proceeded, that the Committee of the Hospital often did not see the patients for months, but that these were left to the care of the medical attendants, who in their turn appear to have left their work to the keepers, and to have done little more than give the sanction of their authority to the system of neglect and brutality in force, and uphold and defend it when attacked. Any one reading their answers to the close cross-questioning of the Committee of the House of Commons, and appreciating the spirit which inspired them, cannot fail to be convinced that the iniquities exposed were but a partial revelation of numbers done in secret and never known, and will even now shudder at the imagination of the cruel sufferings undergone by the unhappy patients already sufficiently afflicted by their disease.

Such, then, was old Bedlam, and such were the iniquities of which it was the home. Last in persistence in the old system of treatment, and worst in its mode of carrying it out, its story, as revealed by the investigation of the House of Commons, has become the eternal disgrace of England, and is still quoted in all parts of the world as evidence of the way in which the insane were treated in this country in 1815. Not justly so, however: chains had for some time been abolished in most other asylums; and it was with horror and indignation that the public discovered the system of cruelty that was being practised, and insisted upon its instant abolition. Indeed, the only persons not horrified by the painful disclosures were those immediately responsible for the disgrace.

In 1815, the new Bethlehem Hospital was built in what was then St. George's-in-the-Fields, but what is now a densely populated part of a low lying district of London, and where, hemmed in and overlooked by houses, it still stands. In front of it, as in front of old

Bedlam, there is a small garden enclosed with iron palings, to the end that passengers, as they walk past, may look in "and see the lunatic people walk for their refreshment when they are a little well of their distemper." Though the old system of cruelty had perished with the old fabric, and could not possibly be restored, yet the traditions of the past did not entirely die out, but appear to have passed by a hereditary transmission to the new fabric and the new officers. The body was dead, but the spirit remained alive; the chains could not be restored, but mechanical restraint of every other kind—canvas gloves, strait-waistcoats, hobbles, and wrist-locks—was systematically employed. Once more the cry of intolerable suffering within was heard without its walls, and once more it was determined to institute an official investigation into the condition of the hospital. Accordingly, in July, 1851, the Commissioners in Lunacy commenced a searching inquiry, examined different witnesses, and finally presented to the Home Secretary a report announcing that several patients had been subjected to harsh and improper treatment by the attendants—that they were neglected by the medical and other officers of the institution; that the bedding, clothing, and accommodation were unfit and insufficient; that the health of one had been materially injured thereby, and the life of another put in peril; and pronouncing "the management and condition of the hospital in many material respects most unsatisfactory." In reading the evidence taken by the Commissioners, it is striking how much the story in 1851 is a repetition of the story disclosed in 1815, allowance being made for the difference of time. There is, happily, a limit to the distance at which the most inveterate obstructive institution or individual can lag behind the spirit of the age. There was no patient now found chained as poor Norris was chained until death released him—that was impossible even at Bethlehem in 1851; but the same heartless neglect, the same spirit of obstructiveness, the same inefficient superintendence, the same strong feeling evinced that the magnificent revenues of the wealthy charity existed for the sake of administrators and officials, and not administrators and officials for the purposes of the charity, and the same incapacity to perceive that the condition and management of the hospital was of any just interest or concern to any one but those who derived interest or profit from it—all these were as plainly exhibited as when they were more completely realized in a more iniquitous practice. The Report of the Commissioners seems to have fixed the responsibility of the bad state of things in great part upon the treasurer: he having, by his own confession, no power whatever except as a member of the board of management, had, by his own authority and at his own pleasure, actually taken from the resident medical officer the duties of classifying the female patients, of deciding which of them should be employed, and of regulating the employment, and of determining in which wards they should be placed; and had invested the matron with this power. He had, in fact, unwarrantably and most injudiciously assigned to her the whole moral treatment of the female patients; and all this mischief he had done of his motion without reporting such interference to the governors. The hiring and discharge of attendants and servants were also in his hands. The evil consequences of a state of things in which the medical officer had all the responsibility, and no power, while the treasurer assumed all the power and no responsibility, may easily be imagined. There was no unity in the management of the hospital, and the patients were grossly neglected and cruelly treated; female patients in the basement of the building were found to have regularly slept entirely naked on loose straw, with only a blanket over them, the poor creatures crawling under the straw in order to try to get warm; and the Commissioners intimate their belief, notwithstanding official denial, that female patients were actually laid naked on the stone floor and mopped with cold water. The backs of the patients were excoriated through lying in wet and dirty straw; and one wonders not, after reading the evidence elicited, that health was sometimes materially injured, and life put in peril.

It would not serve any good purpose to go at length through the evidence taken by the Commissioners, in which facts denied by one witness are admitted as undisputed by another, and statements repudiated at one time by the same witness are acknowledged at another; but it is impossible to restrain surprise and disgust at the singular defence of such neglect and cruelty which Dr. E. T. Monro, who for thirty-five years had been the principal medical officer, and who was the son of him whose reputation suffered so much by the disclosures of 1815, does not shrink from making for himself. "The modern idea appears to incline to that hard-working attention to minute particulars which has never hitherto characterized the mental physician exercising a high profession in a liberal manner; and if the duties of the future medical officer are to be so minute, and so extensive, and so laborious, he must, indeed, be of a very different grade and calibre from all physicians who have heretofore exercised this high calling." It is heartily to be hoped that future mental physicians will be of a very different grade and calibre, and we are convinced that there is nothing by which not the insane only, but the medical profession, will gain so much as by the revolution which Dr. Monro dreaded. This gentleman being closely questioned as to whether a letter, complaining of the ill-treatment to which a patient had been subjected, had not been read at a meeting of the committee of the hospital where he was present, replied, "If I were to speak the truth from my heart, I believe not." Being then pressed as to the particular day on which it was actually read, he said, "I beg your pardon; I will recall what I just said." Then, after a little consideration, he added, "I am taxing my memory to the utmost, and upon second thoughts I do remember," that the letter was read.

It was furthermore elicited by the inquiry that it was the regular practice to discharge a patient whenever, through the progress of dis-

sease or through the effects of neglect and ill-treatment, the health had been so reduced as that death might be apprehended. "All patients," said Dr. Monro, "who are so sick as to require the attendance of nurses are inadmissible; and when they become sick we send them to their relatives. They are discharged as being sick and weak. We do not pretend to provide for any but for the casual sick, and they are never admitted sick and never kept long if they are."

Meanwhile, though Bethlehem Hospital was the scene of such cruelties, and though mechanical restraint had been in systematic use there up to within eighteen months of the date of the commissioners' inquiry, the great modern reform in the treatment of the insane had for some time been accomplished, and the principles of kindness and of moral control had superseded terrorism and mechanical restraint in all other asylums. It was in September, 1839, that Dr. Conolly presented his first report, as resident physician, to the magistrates of the Hanwell Asylum; and it was in that report that the abolition of mechanical restraint in that large asylum was announced. Dr. Conolly had entered on his duties as physician on the 1st of June, 1839, and on the 21st of September there was not a single patient in restraint. "No form of strait-waistcoat, no hand-straps, no leg-locks, nor any contrivance confining the trunk or limbs, or any of the muscles, is now in use," he writes in his first report. Even at so early a period he was able to say "that, notwithstanding some peculiar difficulties, the noise and disorder prevalent in some of the wards have already undergone diminution; that instances of frantic behaviour and ferocity are becoming less frequent; that the paroxysms of mania to which many of the patients are subject are passed over with less outrage and difficulty; and that, if cases are yet seen which appear for a length of time to baffle all tranquillizing treatment, they chiefly, if not exclusively, occur in acute mania, the symptoms of which would be exasperated by severe coercion, or among those who, having been insane many years, have been repeatedly subjected to every variety of violent restraint."* The experiment had previously been made on a small scale at the Lincoln Asylum by the united efforts of Dr. Charlesworth and Mr. Hill, and made successfully. Indeed, it was from witnessing what had been done there that Dr. Conolly was convinced of the practicability of abolishing all forms of mechanical restraint, and determined to carry out the non-restraint system on the large scale which his opportunities at Hanwell afforded. "The example of the Lincoln Asylum, in which no patient has been put in restraint for nearly three years, came also powerfully in aid of an attempt to govern the Asylum at Hanwell by mental restraint rather than by physical." Once the humane system of treatment had been proved successful in an establishment containing at that time nearly one thousand patients, embracing every form both of acute and chronic insanity, it was certain that it must be applicable to every case of insanity, and to every asylum containing insane patients. Accordingly in the face of much prejudice and many obstacles, all forms of bodily restraints for the insane were dispensed with; and after an experience of three years at the Hanwell Asylum, it was established beyond all dispute "that the management of a large asylum is not only practicable without the application of bodily coercion to the patients, but that, after the total disuse of such a method of control, the whole character of an asylum undergoes a gradual and beneficial change." Every succeeding year afforded new and stronger proof of the great benefit of the entire disuse of mechanical restraint; asylum after asylum throughout the country made cautious trial of the new system, ending with its entire adoption, and much praise of its efficacy; and at last that which had been sneered at and rejected as the benevolent dream of enthusiasm was accepted generally as an article of faith not to be questioned. As ever happens in the case of any great practical reform, the non-restraint system was at first declared absurd and impracticable, then grudgingly accepted as worthy of trial under certain circumstances, and finally assimilated into the public habit of thought as a movement not new, nor one for which any individual could justly claim special credit.

How little the inherent justice of the reform would have availed, but for the individual conviction and individual energy by which, through good report and through evil report, its triumph was secured, may easily be perceived by any one who will reflect on the condition of Bethlehem Hospital in 1851, as disclosed by the inquiry of Commissioners in Lunacy, and contrast it with the condition of Hanwell Asylum ten years earlier. Faithful to its traditions, that hospital clung to an evil system as long as this had any lingering vitality, and abandoned it with regret when its utter decay rendered it a public nuisance, calling for public interference. The way in which the governors of Bethlehem received the recommendations of the commissioners proves plainly enough how blind they were to what the welfare of the insane demanded; and it is truly disheartening to read the observations which they thought proper to make in reply to the severe condemnation passed upon the mis-management of the hospital. The commissioners had felt it their duty to reflect upon the treasurer's conduct, to which undoubtedly they thought much of the evil in the state of the hospital was due; and the reply of the governors, signed by this very treasurer, is, that the course adopted by him had been proper and judicious. They are of opinion also that the use of straw covered with a blanket is not unsuitable for the bedding of patients insensible to the calls of nature, and indeed enter into various reasons to show how admirable and indispensable in such cases such bedding is. They could not venture formally

* The Reports of John Conolly, M.D., the Resident Physician of the County Lunatic Asylum at Hanwell, to the Michaelmas Sessions, 1842.

to approve the practice of putting patients on straw, stark-naked, or, as they more euphoniously put it, without a proper supply of night-gowns; but they did not fail to display a lingering love of that practice, and positively to make a sort of defence of it in respect of suicidal patients. To one of their physicians, from whom nothing damaging had been elicited by the commissioners, they feel it due to express their opinion that "all his proceedings in connexion with the hospital have been characterized by industry and kindness;" while they are sorry that the other physician, who had made damaging admissions in his evidence, had not entertained correct views of his duties, "proving the propriety of those changes in the medical staff that have been recently made."

Of the three hundred governors of the hospital at that time, not more than half a dozen probably were really responsible for its unsatisfactory condition, or for the unsatisfactory defence unwisely put forward. Most of them were content to give their support to an excellent charity, and to leave the administration of it entirely to those who, from whatever motives, showed greater interest in it, and gave greater attention to it. This is a fact in the history of many charities, which has been productive of much mischief; and assuredly it would sometimes be much better that a man should cease to be a governor if he ceases to give any thought to the government, than allow the weight of his name and character to be used by a few self-seeking men to prop up a system of gross mismanagement. The governors of Bethlehem in their defence lay stress on the fact that "they assiduously and gratuitously devote a large portion of their time to the superintendence of the charity, and being above the suspicion of having any interested motives, or that they can possibly have any other object than for the perfect good of the institution," they feel it right to express their conviction "that if a mode of investigation, similar to that adopted by the commissioners in their case, were to become general, it would discourage the supporters of numerous public charities, and would deeply injure many of those great institutions of benevolence which are universally regarded as the brightest ornaments of the land." Now what is the real value of such a statement in such a case? It was true, without doubt, as regards the governors generally; but viewed in relation to the actual circumstances, it was simply a complaint on the part of the person principally reflected upon, the treasurer, that unless he were allowed to go on managing affairs as hitherto, and, by such management, inflicting unspeakable suffering upon many unfortunate patients, he would be discouraged. It was surely far less likely that the Commissioners in Lunacy should have interested motives than an officer who, in addition to the power and influence attaching to his office, was provided with a furnished residence at Bridewell Hospital for his services to the charity. There is, unhappily, too much reason to think that many of our large public charities, which, like Bethlehem Hospital, have magnificent endowments, are grossly mismanaged, and, instead of being "the brightest ornaments of the land," they have been so warped from the noble purposes of their founders, as to make right-minded persons grieve heartily. Is it not too true that some of them, falling infinitely short of their just aim, have become vast accumulations of wealth, on which multitudes of parasites cling and live?

To an unprejudiced looker-on, it must have seemed strange that the governors should give so many excellent reasons in favour of a system, in order that they might forthwith abolish it, and so many excellent reasons against the recommendations of the commissioners, in order that they might forthwith adopt them, and carry them into practical operation. Now this was precisely what they wisely did: they accepted the resignations of their physicians and other officers, making them the scapegoats to carry their sins; they appointed a responsible medical superintendent, protecting him from the undue interference of the treasurer, entrusting him with paramount control of the treatment of the patients, and making him responsible for the entire internal management of the institution: they initiated a new and excellent system, with many new officers to carry it into effect. They did not, however, think it necessary to change their treasurer. Though the commissioners had significantly expressed their opinion that the horrible practice of making women lie naked on straw had prevailed for years, and had gone on without challenge from, or even, as it is stated, without the knowledge of the treasurer, the physicians, the resident apothecary, and matron, and had expressly included the treasurer in their censure; and though physicians, apothecary, and matron all resigned, yet the treasurer remained in office. It may well be doubted whether this was not most unwise: the only certain guarantee of an effectual reform is to sweep away, along with the abuses, all those who have been implicated in them. If this is not done, the old spirit is almost sure to revive, and sooner or later to bring forth its accustomed fruits.

Under the new system of management instituted, and under the effectual superintendence of the new physician, Dr. Hood, the condition of the hospital was greatly improved, and it was speedily brought up to the level of similar institutions: for the first time in its history it became an asylum of which the country might be justly proud. No sooner, however, did Dr. Hood resign his office, having well earned the reward of a higher position, than the condition and management of the hospital again excited public attention, and in April, 1864, necessitated another inquiry by the Charity Commissioners. It was found that the rules in force were so framed as entirely to frustrate the true object of the charity: that there were special enactments made to exclude all those insane persons who were so violent or troublesome as to require the special care of an attendant, all who were epileptic or paralytic, all those who had been insane more than twelve months, all those who had been in any other asylum, all those whose precarious condition threatened the dissolution of life, and all those whom disease

or physical infirmity rendered unfit to associate with other patients—all, in fact, who were likely to give any trouble or to require particular care, and were in special need of the benefits which the hospital had been founded to supply. Taught by the bitter experience of the past, the governors seem to have determined that they would not again run the risk of being accused of neglecting and cruelly treating troublesome patients, and consequently to have admitted no case of insanity that was not likely to do them credit. Assuredly it must have been a very hard matter for any lunatic, consistently with his remaining insane, to avoid falling under one or other of the excluding categories. Dogberry instructed the watch that if they met a thief, they should suspect him by virtue of their office to be no true man, and thereupon not apprehend him, but let him steal himself away: the officers of Bethlehem were instructed by their rules, that if a lunatic were brought for admission, they should, by virtue of their office, suspect him to be no sane man, and thereupon not admit him, but drive him elsewhere, and presently thank God that they were rid of a troublesome person. It may be doubted whether in the history of public charities there is a more flagrant instance of injustice than is afforded by this great hospital, with an income of more than £22,000 a-year, providing only for a little more than two hundred insane persons carefully selected from the multitudes urgently needing help. On the 1st January, 1863, there were, exclusive of criminals paid for by the Government, only 201 patients in the hospital; and on the 1st January, 1864, there were 212 patients. In the three years previous to 1843, the admissions of curable patients were 896; in the three years previous to 1853, the number was 898; and in the three years previous to 1863, the admissions were 520. In these three last years there has been, as compared with the three years previous to 1853, actually a decrease of 378 in the admissions, although the demand for asylum accommodation for the poorer members of the middle class has become year by year more and more pressing: on the 1st January, 1863, there were 201 patients in the hospital, although the income was amply sufficient to maintain more than twice that number.

A fact which necessarily came prominently forward at the time of the public discussion concerning the hospital, was the utter unsuitability of the site and building for the purposes of a lunatic asylum. Lord Shaftesbury, giving expression to the strong opinion of the Lunacy Commissioners, condemned it in the House of Lords.

"We take exception," he said, "to the present construction of the building. We maintain that it is most unfit for the purpose. This building was constructed at a time when strait-waistcoats were in vogue, and every patient was immured in a gloomy cell. Though not intended for prison, it was constructed on the same principles as a prison."

And again—

"A most important objection to Bethlehem Hospital as a place for the treatment and cure of insanity remains to be noticed, viz., the unfitness, according to modern opinions, of the building, in respect of its construction and management. The general aspect of the hospital externally and internally, notwithstanding the efforts made within the last few years to enliven the corridors and day-rooms, cannot but exercise a depressing influence upon the inmates, whose means of outdoor exercise are so limited and inadequate. The commissioners in the case of asylums for pauper lunatics would never sanction plans upon the principle of Bethlehem Hospital."

This condemnation of the site and structure of the building was endorsed by the Medical Psychological Association and by the public press, general and medical. And yet, in spite of the agreement of the most competent authorities and of humane men, in spite of an excellent opportunity offered by the proposal of the governors of St. Thomas's Hospital to take the site and the building, in spite of the opposition of the more enlightened of the governors, in spite of the fact that in every country it is now thought necessary to remove asylums for the insane from the crowded towns into the open country, where there is room for out-door exercise, and where there is the opportunity of systematic employment for the patients—essential means of treatment—in spite of all these, the old spirit of obstructiveness prevailed, and it was unhappily determined that Bethlehem Hospital, the home of chains long after chains had disappeared from similar institutions, the last refuge of strait-waistcoats, manacles, straw-bedding, and cruel neglect, should not be unfaithful to its historical character, but should continue to coop up its patients in a prison-like building, and in miserable yards overlooked by neighbouring houses, when open country, cheerful building, opportunity of occupation on farm and garden, are universally admitted to be essentially requisite for the proper treatment of insanity, and are insisted upon in every pauper asylum. That it must sooner or later be moved to a more appropriate site in the country and be made to answer the demands of science and humanity, can admit of no question whatever; but it is painful to think that so excellent an opportunity, and one, probably, which will not recur, should have been lost through the ignorance of those who, having the power, had not a knowledge of the modern requirements for the welfare of the insane. It is painful to think that Bethlehem Hospital should still remain a cause of reproach to England throughout Europe; that foreign physicians who visit this country for the purpose of studying the mode of treating the insane, and who inspect Bethlehem Hospital, attracted by its well-known name, should return home with the belief that the English system, so widely renowned, is an imposture. They easily learn the defects of Bethlehem, but many of them do not learn how universally it is condemned.

In the course of the discussion as to the advantage of removing the hospital into the country, there was, certainly, one good reason urged for keeping it on its present site: this was, that it was conveniently situated as a school for the clinical study of insanity. Indeed, such study

was provided for in the rules which ordained that the resident physician should admit as pupils medical students, that he should give, during each term, a course of lectures, to be illustrated by cases, and that he should also examine the several pupils, and recommend to the committee the most efficient for appointment as clinical clerks. None of these things, however, were done: not a lecture was given at the hospital, no clinical clerk was appointed, no use whatever was made of the valuable material for instruction which it contained; and it appeared, that as far as any good which it had done for science, it might as well have stood in the desert of Sahara as in St. George's-in-the-Fields.

The result of the investigations of the Charity Commissioner, Mr. Martin, and of his examinations of witnesses, was a series of recommendations for the better government of the hospital, and for the better use of its vast revenue. After making certain suggestions with regard to the management of the funds, Mr. Martin recommends that a branch establishment for patients should be provided in the country; that the outrageous rules for excluding patients who were proper objects of charity should be abolished; and that the hospital should be made available for clinical instruction. The changes thus pointed out are undoubtedly most necessary, and if honestly carried into effect cannot fail to be great improvements on the present system; but they certainly do not meet all the requirements of modern reform. The opinion of the Commissioners in Lunacy, whose special knowledge and large experience of what is required for the insane are great, must carry more weight than that of a Charity Commissioner, who cannot be expected to be familiar with the principles of the modern scientific treatment of insanity. Mr. Martin seems, indeed, to have failed to perceive the essence of the matter in dispute between the public and the obstructive governors of Bethlehem; it was not a question of affording a few selected cases of insanity a pleasant change in a country house, but it was a question of certain essential requisites, according to modern opinion, for the proper medical treatment of insanity. To provide a branch establishment in town for the temporary reception of patients, while the hospital itself was removed into the country, would better fulfil the demands of humane and scientific treatment. Suitable employment in farm and garden, and sufficient space for out-door exercise, where the unfortunate patients may not be objects of the gaping curiosity and the vulgar ridicule of the idle and the impertinent—these are essential to a modern hospital for the insane. Whether such means exist or not constitutes in such case the difference between a hospital and a house of detention. Undoubtedly a branch establishment in the country would be a priceless boon to some of the poor patients confined in the present prison-like building; but it is easy to see that the cost would be out of all proportion to the benefit conferred, and that it would simply become another means of squandering the funds. The only reform worth entering upon is the complete reform pointed out and insisted on by the Commissioners in Lunacy, advocated by scientific opinion, and adopted in other countries—the removal of the hospital to a country site, and its reconstruction and reorganization in accordance with the most approved modern principles. Then, only, will it rightly fulfil the important aims of its foundation as these declare themselves in the light of modern progress.

It is no wonder that the weight of obloquy which pressed upon the administration of Bethlehem Hospital was too great to be borne in silence, and that an attempt was made in the annual report for 1864 to show how successful it had been in curing the insane, and how little deserved, therefore, were the attacks made on the site, building, and management. In that report the "attention of the governors and all those interested in obtaining accurate information on the important question of the cure of the insane, is earnestly requested" to certain so-called statistics, which had been compiled by some volunteer defender of the hospital, and eagerly accepted by the authorities. From a comparison of the admissions into Bethlehem, and those into forty-four public asylums, it is made out that the cures in the former were actually 13·16 per cent. higher than the average per centage of other public asylums — that, while only 38·86 per cent of the patients admitted were cured in these, as many as 52·02 per cent. were cured in the much abused hospital. But that is not all; while there is an average of 13·54 per cent. of deaths in the public asylums, there is only 5·05 per cent. in Bethlehem, or, in fact, 8·49 per cent. in favour of the hospital. With a trusting confidence, sublime in its simplicity but terribly misplaced in its object, it is contended that "these facts distinctly show that the situation of Bethlehem Hospital cannot be unhealthy, and that its natural advantages are very great." The surprising part of the matter is, that any one so entirely ignorant of the simplest elements of statistical science, as the author of those figures is proved by them to have been, should have ventured to put forward results so extravagant; but it is more surprising still that any body of men should have covered themselves with ridicule by thoughtlessly accepting them. Such marvellous results might well have startled the most ignorant or the most credulous. A mortality of 13·5 per cent. is a mortality of 135 in the 1,000, while the supposed Bethlehem mortality of 5·02 per cent. is a mortality of 50 in the 1,000; so that the outrageous claim made for the hospital, as against other public asylums, is that is positively saves 85 lives in 1,000. The mortality of the British army, on the deadly Gold Coast, is, as Dr. Robertson, the successful defender of the public asylums, has aptly observed, only 37 in the 1,000 more than in England; and yet, deadly as the service on the Gold Coast is deemed, yet deadlier in their influences on the recently insane, in the ratio of 85 to 37, stand the asylums of the home counties as compared with Bethlehem.* Such figures

* On a recent attempt at the Comparative Statis-

cannot be treated seriously; they have been arrived at simply by ignoring every principle of statistical science as relating to the comparative death-rate of any given population or disease. The death-rate has moreover been calculated on the admissions instead of, as is always rightly done, on the number resident. So again with regard to the recoveries. No notice whatever is taken of the several important circumstances in the character of the cases admitted, which, independently of place or method of treatment, materially influence the results. For example, there is no consideration given to the important question of age, although it is established that, under the age of twenty-five, as many as three-fifths of the insane recover, while, after sixty, scarce more than one in six recovers. And yet the very erroneous table given in the Bethlehem report shows that as many as ten public asylums, receiving all sorts and conditions of cases, attained a higher percentage of cures than Bethlehem Hospital. The "Eighteenth Report of the Commissioners of Lunacy," which gives the correct statistics of different asylums, shows that the proportion of cures in Bethlehem, notwithstanding the careful selection of cases for admission, is exceeded by other public asylums; and that its mean annual mortality, notwithstanding its systematic rejection of every case that seemed likely to die, and of every case that seemed not likely to get well, was 57 in the 1,000, while at the Warneford Asylum, Oxford, the annual mortality was 21 only in the 1,000, at Coton Hill, 52, and at the Retreat, 52. As far as any argument in such case can be founded on figures, it assuredly strengthens the general condemnation of the site, structure, and management of the hospital.

Does not the history of Bethlehem Hospital reveal, only too plainly, how vast are the difficulties in the way of practical reform, even when its principles are universally accepted? Ever as the course of progress takes a different direction, and as new questions arise, does the old spirit reassert itself, and as it resisted advance in the past, so again resists the impulses of present progress. Were it not that nature has happily put a period to human life, it may be doubted whether any great reform would ever be accomplished. But as the old men, imbued with the spirit of bygone thought, drop away, younger men, inspired with the spirit of progress, take up the work and carry it on, until they, in their turn, become old and petrify in cold obstruction. In some of the large London hospitals, it has recently been found necessary to enact that the officers should retire after reaching a certain age; so much had these noble charities suffered by the tenacious clinging to office of those whom age had rendered incapable of fulfilling their duties. Had this excellent rule been always in force at Bethlehem, how much obloquy would it have escaped—how much cruel suffering might have been spared to numbers of unfortunate patients—how great a reproach might have been spared to England! Had the rule been in force even during the last few years, it cannot be doubted that some response would have been made to the humane and scientific views of the age, that something would have been done to make this wealthy charity meet the pressing claims for the benefits which it was so well capable of supplying. To point out what these needs are is to pass the severest condemnation on the administration of the hospital, and to present the most conclusive evidence of its inefficiency.

A special and most urgent want at the present time, repeatedly and earnestly insisted on by the Commissioners in Lunacy, individually and collectively, and by every one whose experience has made known to him the great necessity, is that of suitable asylum accommodation for the poorer members of the middle-class—those who are poor, but not poor enough to be paupers. For such persons, as Lord Shaftesbury truly says, "nothing worthy of the name of treatment or accommodation can now be obtained, except at a cost which is ruinous to clerks, tradespeople, and hard labourers in various professions. The misery that follows affliction of this kind in families such as I have mentioned is indescribable." What is to become of the father of the family, and of the family dependent for support upon his daily exertions, when he is struck down with insanity—the most expensive of diseases? At the same moment he becomes a terrible expense and the means of livelihood cease. Or, what shall he, with an income on which he can just contrive to maintain his family, do when his wife or one of his children is so miserably afflicted? As a matter of fact, the suffering caused by insanity amongst the lower middle-class is beyond description. Repeated attempts have been made to furnish asylum accommodation suitable to their means, and with partial success. There are eleven middle-class public asylums in England, receiving between 500 and 600 patients; but they are mostly situated in the northern and midland counties, and are not sufficient for the demands made on them there—for the southern and home counties there is no similar provision at all. In Scotland there is excellent provision of the kind; there are seven chartered asylums, built by private benevolence, and which are now self-supporting. Now, the want felt everywhere in England is, as may be supposed, most grievously felt in the metropolis, where the high pressure of active competition leads to frequent mental failures, where so many persons are day by day entirely dependent on the work they do, where health is capital, where not to go forward in the race is to go back. For the insane poor there is everywhere the most ample and satisfactory provision made in the different county and borough asylums; but these admirable institutions cannot admit any but paupers. The true mission of Bethlehem Hospital is therefore plainly marked out—to supply the asylum accommodation so pressingly needed for the lower middle classes. With its magnificent income of more than £22,000 a year rightly applied and faithfully managed, it has funds enough to provide for at least 400 insane persons, without

tics of Bethlehem Hospital and the English County Asylums. By C. L. Robertson, M. D.—*Journal of Mental Science. October*, 1865.

making any charge whatever for maintenance. But it is not necessary, nor is it perhaps well, that it should receive all patients entirely charitably; those who could afford to pay for their maintenance might pay a moderate sum, and those who could only afford to pay a little towards their maintenance might pay that little. Thus would the revenues of the hospital be considerably increased, and its capacity of doing good be largely extended; instead of receiving only 200 patients, there might be accommodation provided for 600 insane persons. Thus would one of the most urgent wants of the day be met, and thus would the hospital best fulfil the charitable aim of its foundation.

Another want sorely felt in the metropolis is the opportunity of clinical instruction in mental diseases for medical students. With the exception of Dr. Conolly's lectures, delivered at the Hanwell Asylum thirteen years ago, when he was physician, there never has been available means of gaining a knowledge of this most important branch of medical practice; year after year men enter on practice, never perhaps having seen a single case of insanity. And yet they not only have to treat this most serious disease as they have to treat other diseases, and to treat it at that early stage when there is always the best and sometimes the only chance of success, but they are called upon in courts of justice to give evidence with regard to it that may affect both property and life. On them, again, is imposed by law the duty of signing certificates of unsoundness of mind, under which an insane person is deprived of his liberty. Considering the serious and sacred interests involved in a medical opinion respecting insanity, and the grave responsibility incurred by the medical man, it is plainly most desirable that mental diseases should receive particular attention, and be a necessary branch of medical education, instead of being entirely neglected, as they are at present. But it is only within the last year that the Senate of the University of London, recognising the importance of a knowledge of mental diseases, and willing to insist on such knowledge from the candidates for degrees, has been compelled to refrain from issuing any compulsory regulations to secure that most desirable result, solely because of the absence of means and opportunity of instruction; it was impossible to enforce on the student a knowledge which it was impossible for him to get. How much the public interests and the medical profession have suffered by the long neglect of the study of insanity may easily be imagined by any one who calls to mind the great scandals that have occurred in regard to cases of insanity, and reflects on the outrageous character of the evidence frequently given in courts of justice. Whether an insane person who has committed murder is hanged as a criminal, or confined as a lunatic, is notoriously very much a matter of accident; and it is beyond question that persons really sane are sometimes acquitted as insane, while others really insane are executed. And what else can happen so long as men are called upon to give scientific evidence respecting a most obscure disease which they have never had any opportunity of studying, and perhaps, as may happen, of which they have never seen an example? By affording clinical instruction in mental diseases at Bethlehem Hospital, by instituting a course of lectures, and by making the hospital, like other metropolitan hospitals, a school for the scientific study of disease, the governors would not only supply a grievously felt want, but they would greatly advance the interests of medical science, and confer much real benefit on the public. But if they should persist in ignoring those claims and duties arising out of the interests entrusted to them; if they refuse to give the needy insane the full benefit of the vast revenues of which they have the charge; if they persevere in closing the doors of the hospital in the face of the afflicted rightly demanding its charitable help, and in the face of those who may justly claim the opportunity of clinical study which it is so well fitted to supply; then the importance of the subject is so great, and the public interests concerned so grave, that it may be hoped, and confidently expected, that parliamentary interposition will take place, and secure for the future the just application of the funds and the good government of the hospital. It is impossible that a lunatic hospital so strongly condemned by those who are the official guardians of the insane, and by public and scientific opinion, can be allowed to continue to be, as it has unhappily hitherto for the most part been, an ever recurring scandal and disgrace. It is impossible that those entrusted with the administration of a wealthy public charity can be allowed for ever to deprive the public of the full benefit of its magnificent income, and to frustrate the noble aim of its foundation. If the many excellent and benevolent men whose names are found in the list of governors would but cease to be only nominal governors, and begin to take a real earnest interest in the government of the hospital, then assuredly would enlightened views prevail, and a reform, proceeding from within, obviate the necessity of a public interference otherwise inevitable.

Painful as it is to find any institution for the insane falling short of the humane and scientific requirements of the age, and calling for public censure, there is yet one point of view from which the fact may be regarded with some gratification. When we call to mind what was the treatment of the insane at the beginning of this century, and reflect on what it is in which Bethlehem now falls short of modern requirements, we are enabled to realize vividly the great reform which has been accomplished. And there is the best hope of the endurance of the new system, because it is not a practical improvement dictated only by the transitory impulses of benevolence, but it has been deliberately organized in accordance with scientific theory of the nature of insanity, and approved by successful trial. Science and practice have gone hand-in-hand, and have furthered one another's progress. Herein lies the vast difference between the modern theory and treatment of insanity, and the theory and practice which have prevailed at any other time. The disordered mind is distinctly recognized as the func-

tional manifestation of a diseased organ; and though very little is known of the actual morbid conditions in the organ, yet the investigations of the microscopist are steadily revealing the evidences of disease where a little time since none were recognizable, and those who have given the greatest attention to the subject are those who are most surely convinced of the invariable existence of organic change. Where the subtlety of nature so much exceeds the subtlety of the means of investigation, it causes no surprise and no disappointment that the senses, with their present aids, cannot yet penetrate the most secret recesses of her complex operations. But to conclude from the non-appearance of morbid change in some cases of insanity to the non-existence thereof, as was at one time done, would be the same as if the blind man were to maintain that there are no colours, or the deaf man that there are no sounds.

In conclusion, it is interesting to observe how gradually, but surely, the scientific theory of insanity is influencing modern psychology. As pathological phenomena often afford valuable aid in the determination of physiological problems, so the manifestations of the mind disordered are frequently alterations in the conditions of a psychological problem such as cannot be produced artificially—experiments, in fact, made by nature, but which are most instructive and helpful in the formation of an inductive science of mind. And so it is happily coming to pass that madness, once the subject of foolish superstition, and afterwards the prey of ignorant and brutal keepers of asylums, is now becoming the study and care of scientific physicians, and is taking its due place in the appropriate system of scientific development. Those who think it no shame to make a foolish sneer at medicine, because it is not an exact science, and because it cannot cure the Cattle Plague, and who venture to depreciate what it has done for mankind, would do well to reflect upon what it has done for the insane, and to remember that it is to the medical profession, little aided from without, that the great reform in the treatment of the insane is due. It can admit of no doubt that, when questions now occupying a large space in public attention have long been entirely forgotten, this reform will be remembered as one of the chief glories of this century.

Postscript.—During the passage of the foregoing pages through the press, there has been announced the death of him to whose firm convictions, benevolent feeling, and persevering labours the modern humane reform in the treatment of the insane mainly owed its practical origin and consummate triumph. Dr. John Conolly has now gone where praise can neither reach, nor censure touch him more; but though he has passed away, the great work which he accomplished remains a noble monument of his life, and cannot but abide in the memories of men as long as humane feeling and benevolent aspirations live in their hearts.

Art. III.—The Situation in Austria.

1. *Stenographische Berichte der 2ten und 3ten Sessionen des Abgeordnetenhauses.* Wien: 1863-4.
(*Stenographic Reports of the 2nd and 3rd Sessions of the House of Representatives.* Vienna: 1863-4.)
2. *Siste Viator. Ein Gedenkblatt für Oesterreichs Völker.* Wien: 1865.
(*Siste Viator. A Memento for the People of Austria.* Vienna: 1865.)
3. *Oesterreichs Staatsidee.* Von Franz Palacky.
(*Austria's State-idea.* By Francis Palacky.)
4. *Drei Jahre Verfassungsstreit. Beiträge zur jüngsten Geschichte Oesterreichs.* Von einem Ungar. Leipsig: 1864.
(*Three Years' Constitutional Conflict. Contributions to the latest History of Austria.* By a Hungarian. Leipsig: 1864.)
5. *Parlamentarisches Taschenbuch für den ungarischen Reichstag.* Pesth: 1866.
(*Parliamentary Pocket-book for the Hungarian Diet.* Pesth: 1866.)
6. *Stenographische Berichte verschiedener Oestreichischen Landtage.* Wien: 1866.
(*Stenographic Reports of Different Austrian Diets.* Vienna: 1866.)

Again the eyes of statesmen, and all who take an interest in Continental politics, are directed with more than usual attention to the Austrian Empire. Again there is a change of scene in the constitutional drama which is being enacted in that heterogeneous State. Again national and party spirit runs high, displaying marked contrasts in opinions respecting the latest phase of Imperial policy, and also in the feelings and expectations with which the future is regarded. Exactly three years ago we laid before the readers of this Review a *résumé* of the important events of the years 1860-1, and of the motives which had induced the Emperor of Austria, on the 20th October, in the first of those years, suddenly to surprise and gladden the hearts of the various peoples over whom he held sway with the solemn declaration that the system of absolutism was at last positively renounced, and that henceforth, for the State as a whole, and for the different kingdoms and countries—in harmony with their historical rights and modern requirements—constitutional forms of legislation and government would be established. We further called attention to the mixed sentiments of pleasure and dissatisfaction with which the provisions of the October Diploma had been received by the different nationalities; pointed out the errors committed by Count Goluchowski, whom the Emperor had entrusted with the portfolio of the Interior, that he might carry out his intentions, as well as other causes of discontent, in consequence of which his Majesty ere long found it necessary to call a more popular functionary to his aid, under whose influence fresh Imperial decrees were published in the following February, introducing a centralized parliamentary *régime* for the Empire as a whole. In these new decrees, the so-called Patent, the spirit of the original constitution was in several

respects departed from; and although great satisfaction was thereby given to Vienna centralists, and indeed, to the population of the Austro-German provinces in general, yet the Slavonic races, and many enlightened politicians in all parts of the empire, found serious cause for complaint, seeing in the form the Constitution had received in the February decrees the deathblow to their hopes of progress, based on the principles of justice to all the nationalities, self-government, and the continuity of historical rights. The prospect of an amicable arrangement with Hungary, moreover, became greatly diminished.

After a careful survey of the policy of M. de Schmerling—the new Minister for the Interior—and of the proceedings in the "minority parliament" to which he had given life, up to the close of the first session of nearly twenty months' duration, we expressed our conviction that in neither were to be found the germs of vitality; and we indulged the hope that ere long the Emperor would place the management of affairs in the hands of other statesmen, of men with broader views and more catholic sentiments of freedom, in order that the Constitution might be remodelled more in harmony with the promises of the Diploma. Late events have given reality to our prophecies and aspirations: after a five years' trial of a one-sided central Parliament—which Hungarians steadfastly refused to acknowledge, and from which the Czechs of Bohemia and Moravia had, on principle, withdrawn —Francis Joseph last July again changed his Ministers, and on the 20th September, in a "Manifesto" to his people, he appealed to them all for confidence and support in a policy of conciliation and mutual agreement respecting the form of the central representation of the Empire. In a "Patent" of the same date, countersigned by all the Ministers, he further suspended the action of the lesser Reichsrath, greatly to the satisfaction of three-fourths of the population of Austria. That the most politically educated nation, the Hungarian, is included in this numerical estimate, is well known; and viewing the fact that two-thirds of the people on this side the Leitha* have approved the September Manifesto, it would seem that at length the Emperor had entered upon a path which must lead to a solution of his difficulties. Notwithstanding this wide-spread approval, however, the task which the present advisers of the Crown have undertaken, will—apart from the Hungarian question — tax to the utmost their energies and skill, in consequence of the decided opposition they encounter from a very compact and influential body of politicians, belonging to the German and bureaucratic elements of the empire.

It will assist in the understanding of the situation if we cast a rapid glance at the history of the suspended Reichsrath. When the first session was opened, nearly all the cis-Leitha Diets had elected their quotas of representatives to the Lower Chamber. In the speech from the Throne, the hope was expressed that the Diets of Hungary and connected countries would likewise soon select and send representatives, that the Reichsrath might thus become complete. In a short time the Diet of Croatia assembled, but as it refused to accept the Diploma and February Patent, it was forthwith dismissed. The Hungarian Diet met too, but, from causes hereafter to be mentioned, it did not even come to any discussion of the October and February Constitutions, and was likewise soon dissolved. In Transylvania no Diet was convened, and thus the Government continued to uphold the principle that the assembly in Vienna was the lesser Reichsrath only. Nevertheless, as Schmerling wished to give as much support as possible to the Constitutionalists, an Imperial declaration appeared at the close of 1861, to the effect that ministers were authorized to lay the Budget of that year before the Reichsrath, and that, although it was only the lesser body, and had not the right to deal with the question, yet the Emperor would receive its resolutions as if they were those of the complete Parliament. A few months later the Budget for 1862 was also submitted to the House of Representatives, despite the objections raised by the Conservative and Czech members. Both Budgets were passed with but trifling restrictions, and the propositions of the Government for new taxes and new loans met with approval. In these and other matters the lesser Reichsrath acted as if it were the full body, and the ministers, in most cases, tacitly allowed this proceeding.

The second Session began in June, 1863, and lasted till the middle of February, 1864. In the speech from the Throne, the terms "lesser," or "full Reichsrath," were not mentioned, the word Reichsrath only being used. No Diet had been convened in Hungary or Croatia; but in Transylvania a Diet based on new *octroyé* laws had been called. The Magyar population, which previous to 1848 had been the dominating one, refused to accept these new electoral laws, and consequently took no part in this Diet, which it declared to be illegal. It consisted entirely of members of the Saxon and Roumain nationalities, who at once accepted Diploma and Patent, and in the autumn of 1863 elected members for the Reichsrath. Upon this, the Government declared the Reichsrath was to be considered as complete, and in many ways took pains to make the difference between full and lesser Reichsrath as little apparent as possible. In this Session subjects were dealt with, often on one and the same day, which legally belonged only to one or other of those bodies, the representatives from Transylvania (a great part of whom were officials) being called upon to leave the House or return to their seats, according to circumstances. In this Session, likewise, the Reichsrath received the Government proposals for further increase of taxation and new loans in a very accommodating spirit, opposing the ministers only by striking out inconsiderable sums required for the army and navy. In respect, however, to necessary and urgent requirements for these services, the Upper House was on the side of the ministers, till at length this branch of the Legislature yielded to pressing appeals of Schmerling and the Minister of Finance, who declared that they had been obliged

* The river separating Hungary from Austria.

to give way in the Lower House, for otherwise it would not have been possible to procure another much-needed loan. The unpleasant position in which the Upper House had thus been placed, tended in the end to shake its confidence in the State minister.

The powerful party of German centralist-Liberals, whose seats were on the left side of the Lower House (as is the case in all the Austro-German Diets), consisted originally for the most part of personal friends of Schmerling, and of others who shared his sentiments. Indeed, several of the chief speakers on this side owed their elections to his personal influence. These men naturally felt grateful to him for having, so to say, smothered the Diploma, and placed power in their hands. Yet this was not enough. They wanted, as quickly as possible, to make use of their majority to introduce changes in the Constitution, agreeing with their interpretation of Liberalism—changes which could only be accomplished if the "lesser" were in every respect considered equivalent to a "full Reichsrath." They wanted, in particular, a law acknowledging the responsibility of ministers, the necessity for their resigning whenever a majority in the Lower House should be against them—a law, in fact, clearly beyond the function of this fractional Parliament to pass. On the other hand, they likewise wanted to legislate on subjects exclusively relating to the countries on this side the Leitha, and which legally belonged only to the lesser Reichsrath. The party on the left having by degrees actually succeeded in rendering the difference between full and lesser Reichsrath but little apparent, it was in their interest to perpetuate this state of things by exercising the functions of both promiscuously. By thus proceeding, it was in their power to make the Government feel that without such concessions as they desired, the supplies would not be voted; for by occupying the House with business properly belonging to the lesser Reichsrath only, the introduction of the Budget could be delayed at pleasure until the Cabinet had to give way. Schmerling's position, therefore, came to be very peculiar. On the one hand, he had to convince the Emperor that only through his influence over the House could the Liberals be induced to grant the supplies for the army and other services of the State; whilst on the other hand, he had to prove to that party that he alone understood how to obtain for it the desired concessions. These manœuvres succeeded the first year. By degrees, however, it came to an end with the concessions which Schmerling himself was disposed to make (he never, for instance, could be brought to acknowledge the responsibility of ministers to a majority of the Reichsrath), as well as with such as he could persuade the Emperor to grant. Thus at the close of the second Session a complete disunion between him and the left became apparent. The question of ministerial responsibility, in especial, embarrassed him greatly. At the beginning of the second Session, the House of Representatives had wanted to make a draught for a law on this head which Schmerling prevented by declaring, that as it was only the lesser Reichsrath, it was not qualified so to act. Later, however, when the members from Transylvania were procured, the Liberals declined to deliberate on the Budget, unless the responsibility of ministers was acknowledged. This led to an explanation by Schmerling that the Emperor accepted the principle of the responsibilities of ministers, and that as soon as the Hungarian question should be solved, a law to that effect would be introduced. In continual disputes and compromises time passed away; meanwhile, the state of the finances became more and more gloomy, for the burthens of the people increased, owing to the rapid growth of the National Debt, and at the same time a continually enlarging deficit. What the inevitable result of this state of things must be, neither ministers nor Reichsrath took soriously into consideration, and nothing occurred likely to lead to an understanding with Hungary. In many parts of the empire, particularly in the Slavonic countries and Tyrol, discontent was greatly on the increase.

On the 12th November, 1864, the third Session of the Reichsrath began, and now the Government, in contrast to its previous conduct, attempted strictly to define and separate the functions of the lesser and the complete Reichsrath. The speech from the Throne announced that the representatives were assembled principally that they should exercise the functions of a complete Reichsrath, and take into consideration the Budget for 1865-6. When this business should be brought to a close, and not till then, the House was told, would it be permitted to enter upon the duties of the lesser Reichsrath. By proceeding in this way, the Government probably intended to prevent the party on the left from mixing together different kinds of business, and thus postponing at their pleasure the consideration of the Budget. The ministerial tactics were little to the taste of the Liberals, and the debate on the Address gave convincing proof, if such were needed, that the breach between Schmerling and the left was complete. But now at last the House began in all earnest to take into consideration the state of the finances—a thing it could equally well have done in former sessions. There was now, likewise, some talk about the necessity of an arrangement with Hungary. In this Session contentions on the financial question were almost of daily occurrence. At the first attack on the Budget, the Government was induced to express its readiness to strike off 20 million florins from the sum originally demanded, in case the House would pass the remainder in a lump for the financial years 1865-66. This, however, the House refused to do, and began to occupy itself with the separate items. The exchequer meanwhile becoming nearly empty, the Minister of Finance explained to the House that he must forthwith be credited with 120 million florins in the pressing interests of the State. By way of instalment, 13 millions were granted; but every further demand, it was said, would be refused, until the Budget, as revised by the House, should be accepted. With this arrangement the Minister of Finance had to be satisfied, and he accepted the 13 millions. Whilst the debates and contests on the Budget

were in progress, the Emperor, contrary to the wish of his ministers, undertook a journey to Pesth. There hopes were raised, and the promise was given that the Diet would soon be summoned. Subsequently Majláth was named Court-Chancellor, and this, too, shortly after Schmerling had explained to the Lower House that it could be only with the ultra-Liberal party in Hungary that an understanding would be possible, as in the party to which Majláth belonged were to be found his decided opponents. About the same time the debates on the Budget began in the Upper House, and in this, too, the truth at last was spoken. Archduke Rainer, and with him the whole party of Schmerling in the Cabinet, now resigned. Previous to his official appointment as successor of Schmerling, Count Belcredi declared it possible to carry on the business of the State with the reduced Budget. Upon this, it was accepted by the Upper House; soon afterwards Belcredi was named Minister of State, and on the 27th July the session of the Reichsrath was brought to a close.

This historical retrospect of the lesser Reichsrath—however imperfect, as some useful legislation was likewise undertaken by it—may suffice to show that its suspension was neither a capricious nor arbitrary act on the part of the Emperor, but forced upon him by circumstances beyond his control. It will also show—to quote the words of the author of the pamphlet second on our list—that "Schmerling did not fall by parliamentary action; not in consequence of the adverse votes of his originally pliant followers. Neither did he fall, as has been asserted, because he was unable to come to an understanding with Hungary. In this view cause and effect are confounded. The understanding with Hungary failed because the system which Schmerling pursued was doomed to fail, and for the simple reason that it was opposed to the innermost nature, the life-conditions and the requirements of the countries of which Austria is composed." Indeed, shortly before the end of his ministerial career, he candidly confessed, much to the annoyance of the Vienna Radicals, that a complete Reichsrath was an impossibility. Nevertheless some of his former supporters have latterly attempted to make a distinction in principle between the Reichsrath and the minister, with the view of exalting the former at the expense of the latter; and it has been asserted in the Diet of Lower Austria, that "just as the Reichsrath had prepared the way for an arrangement with Hungary, it was sent about its business." We can find no facts to warrant this assertion; for although, as we have mentioned, in the last session there was some cry in the House for an understanding with Hungary, yet it was always connected with the impossible condition that Hungary should acknowledge the Reichsrath. "If, indeed," says the author we have just quoted, "a complete parliament of all the lands on this side the Leitha had been a reality, and not a fiction, then the position of Hungary would have been very different, and its history have run a rapid course. If the other members of the realm had lost their inherent character, if that which neither the patriarchal *régime* before the revolution (1848), nor the despotic power of Bach, nor the parliamentary absolutism of Schmerling could accomplish, had by any other means obtained, and all the kingdoms and countries on this side the Leitha been welded into a uniform homogeneous and centralized whole, then of necessity either the empire must have been broken up, or the western half, with its machine-like power, must necessarily have destroyed the political organism in the eastern half." It is, in fact, to this attachment to their historical rights, to the requirements of national development, and to the inherent repulsion of so large a portion of the people of Austria to any system of rigid centralization, that Hungary now, in all probability, owes its last chance of preserving its individuality; whilst, such are the laws of action and reaction, the devotion of the Hungarians of all classes to their time-honoured *constitutio avitica*, has mainly assisted the patriots in the western countries of the empire.

Count Richard Belcredi, the present minister for the Interior, is a second son, and descended from a family of Italian origin, long possessed of landed property in Moravia. He is still in his prime, having been born in February, 1823. In early youth he was sent to the public school of a small provincial town in Bohemia, whereby he came into nearer relationship with the citizen classes than is usual with youthful members of the aristocracy in Austria, who are generally educated at home. His school education completed, he became a student of law at the University of Prague. Soon after he had there taken his degree, he entered into the administrative service of the State. In the year 1854 he became chief (*Kreishauptmann*) of the political circuit of Znaim; in 1861, chief of the political administration in the province of Silesia; and in May, 1863, he was advanced to the post of Vice-President of the Government in Bohemia. A year later he was made Lord-Lieutenant (*Statthalter*) of that kingdom, and a member of the privy council. As a deputy from the Diet of Silesia, and subsequently from that of Bohemia, he entered the Lower House in the Reichsrath, seating himself in the centre, on the so-called "Count's Bench," and voting for the most part with the ministers. He did not often rise to speak, but whenever he did, he gave unmistakable proofs of sound knowledge of the subjects under debate, and of a highly-educated and logical mind. Even those who did not share his opinions did justice to his urbanity, and to the comprehensive and lucid way in which he explained his views. His intellectual powers were equally conspicuous in the sphere of his official duties. Untiring activity, well-grounded knowledge, and a great talent for organization, soon caused him to be considered one of the most distinguished functionaries in the Administration. A quick workman himself, he also well knew how to stimulate his subordinates and keep the State mechanism in rapid movement. Under his control, the usual complaints of bureaucratic dilatoriness lost their

point. In the Reichsrath, Count Belcredi seems to have avoided any expression of opinion on those important Constitutional questions which agitate the minds of opposing parties. When he, therefore, became Minister of State, speculation was rife as to the way he would shape his course—whether it would be more in harmony with the views of the Federalists, or those of the Centralists. His motto, however, was said to be "political centralization and administrative decentralization." His measures, so far, have been decidedly favourable to self-government, simplification, and diminution of bureaucratic control.* Probably for this reason, and for another presently to be mentioned, he is not popular with the officials in general; and, contrary to the usual policy of this class, the greater number of those having seats in the different Diets have lately voted against the Government. From those who are acquainted with Count Belcredi we have gathered that, previous to his acceptance of the onerous post offered him by the Emperor, he was careful to acquaint the monarch with his views and prospective measures. He strictly defined, it is said, his conditions, demanding and receiving promises of support. In addition to the post of Minister for the Interior, the Count is President of the Cabinet, a position not accorded to his predecessor; and he likewise, for the present, holds the portfolio of Minister of Police.

An article openly attributed to Count Belcredi, which appeared early last November in a Vienna paper favourable to the Government (*Wiener Abendpost*), and which went the round of the Austrian press, affords considerable insight into the views of this minister. It is considered to be in answer to two articles published in another Vienna paper (*Die Presse*), from the pen of Count Eugen Kinsky, in which the September Manifest was attacked. In his reply, the minister aims at showing that this attack is based upon a blind, perhaps wilful, ignoring of the real cause of its promulgation, and of the vital principle at issue—namely, "a true appreciation of the actual circumstances in the various countries of Austria, and of the necessity for a solution of difficulties by mutual agreement." With regard to the suspension of the law on the representation of the empire, and the unreasonable demand that a limit to this measure should at once be fixed, the writer says, "The chief ground for this step has been stated to be the impossibility, according to right, of making one and the same constitutional form (*Verfassungsbestimmung*) a subject for deliberation and decision in one portion of the realm, whilst in the other it was being acted upon as an established law of general applicability.† The suspension, moreover, apart from any capricious interpretation of motives, displays the evident purpose of calming the public mind, and rendering it more open to compromise in that quarter where the law on the representation of the empire has encountered the most strenuous opposition. This suspension, however, can in no respect be considered in itself as an end, but merely as a withdrawal of constitutional life from its localization to extend it into general activity by embracing all the peoples (Völker) of Austria." The article further shows, by citing paragraphs in the Diploma and Patent, that it is only by the exercise of sophistry, by making use of isolated passages in the latter document torn from their connexion with preceding paragraphs in the former, to which they refer, that arguments against the September Manifest are supported. It is shown, in particular, that—

"Article II. of the February Patent distinctly refers to a letter from the Emperor on the 20th October, 1860, to the Hungarian Court-Chancellor, wherein it is said that the fundamental State affairs (*Staatsrechtliche Verhaltnisse*) of Hungary must be definitively settled by the Diet of that country in the sense of its laws; such settlement being also distinctly stated in the February Patent as the preliminary condition of the validity of the constitution of the Empire. So long as this condition is unfulfilled, it is not legally possible for the Hungarian Diet to send representatives to the Reichsrath; and as long as this possibility does not obtain, there can be no question that the law respecting the representation of the Empire is *de jure* inoperative. This law has, however, for some time been actually in operation, but this rested upon a fiction, or more correctly expressed, upon an anticipation: upon the unrealized hope that the preliminary condition mentioned in the Patent would subsequently receive force from some kind of State action."

In another part of the article it is said:—

"Although the western half of the Empire has not already acquired a right to a central representation, yet to render a legal claim to a common (*gemeinsame*) treatment of affairs, common to all, practicable, is in every case an object which the Government, as well as the people, must most earnestly strive to accomplish."

The Chief Minister himself having—as we have but imperfectly shown by a few extracts from a long and closely reasoned article—descended into the journalistic arena to measure his strength with an antagonist considered worthy of his pen, the conflict of opinions respecting the September Act was carried on with redoubled vigour in the Austrian press in general. Thus, before the meeting of the Diets, arguments *pro* and *con* were exhausted, and the Centralists and the Federalists (as the adherents of the Government are called) had fully made up their minds how to act. The leading politicians of the Austro-German Diets in particular had held a meeting in Vienna, and come to a general decision on their resolutions and addresses to the Throne. All the Diets of the countries on this side the Leitha, seventeen in number, met towards the end of last November. We give below, in a tabular form, the votes for and against the present Government in the different Diets, with the population of the countries represented, the number of members in each Diet, and their quotas of deputies to the Reichsrath, according to the Patent of February, 1861:—

* For instance, he has reduced the number of circuits (*Kreise*) in the different lands, increased the administrative functions of local elected authorities, and placed the rural police in the hands of the communes.

† This passage is the same as one in the September Manifest.

Countries and Seats of Diets.	Population represented.		In respect to the Sep. Patent; Votes for and against the Ministry.		Number of Members in the Diet.	Reichsrath.
Galicia—Lemberg	4,612,000		149	1	150	38
Bukowina—Czernowitz . . .	462,000		30	—	30	5
*Moravia—Brünn	1,877,994		51	42	100	22
*Carniola—Laibach	451,941		18	12	37	6
Görz-Gradiska—Görz	195,000		13	6	22	2
Istria—Parenzo	235,000		30	—	30	2
Trieste—Trieste	95,000		36	4	40	2
Dalmatia—Zara	404,499		32	3	43	5
Bohemia—Prague	4,705,525		118	97	241	54
		13,038,959				
Lower Austria—Vienna . . .	1,681,697		10	46	66	18
Upper ditto—Linz	707,450		12	34	50	10
Styria—Grautz	1,056,773		7	50	63	13
Salzburg	146,769		—	26	26	3
Silesia—Troppau	443,912		1	30	31	6
Carinthia—Klagenfurth . . .	332,456		7	28	37	5
Vorarlberg—Bregenz	102,000		2	18	20	2
		4,471,057				
†Tyrol—Innspruck	774,000		—	—	68	10
			513	393		

It will be seen in the above table that seven of the Diets, representing a population of about four and a half millions, have, either in resolutions or addresses to the Throne, expressed more or less dissatisfaction with the September Act. It has been most decidedly pronounced in the addresses of the Diets of Lower Austria and Vorarlberg. That of the latter little province was couched in language so violent and disrespectful to the Crown that it has not been received. In this land, as in Tyrol, the greater portion of the country population has always been opposed to the policy of the late Government; and it has been owing to the influence of the Protectionist wealthy German manufacturers and the people in their employ (most of them immigrants from Switzerland and Southern Germany) that the action of the Diet has been decided.

The Diets of Galicia, Bukowina, Bohemia, and of the coast-lands (Istria, Trieste, &c.), have acted in a direction contrary to the above, and have presented addresses to the Throne expressing deep-felt gratitude for the September Manifest, and the change of policy involved therein. The Diet of Dalmatia likewise voted an address approving the Manifest, but at the same time regretting the suspension of the lesser Reichsrath. This clause was introduced through the influence of the officials, too many of whom, owing to Schmerling's election manœuvres, have seats in this assembly, greatly to the dissatisfaction of the Slavonic population of that country. If we include Dalmatia, the Diets which, in addresses to the Throne, have expressed approval of the September Act, represent a population of upwards of ten and a half millions.

We have perused and pondered the speeches for and against the Ministry in nearly all the above-named Diets. In each the political chief, or some high functionary of the land represented, explained and defended the Government measures, using arguments substantially the same as those we have quoted from the article by Count Belcredi. In the Austro-German Diets, particularly in that held at Vienna, opposition to the Government has been the most strongly, indeed in some instances, vehemently and satirically pronounced. But the powers of oratory, sarcasm, and special pleading in this Diet, as in others, appear to have been exercised in vain as regards influence over the voting. The speakers, indeed, seem mainly to have aimed at the applause of the galleries (which they earned in a fashion opposed to our English notions of Parliamentary etiquette), and of the press on their side. The best and most temperate speech of the Opposition is that of the Automist, M. de Kaiserfeld,* in the Styrian Diet. He exhausted all the logical arguments against the suspension of the lesser Reichsrath. (His opponents say he stirred up much logical dust to obscure the vision as to the common-sense bearing of the question.) But he did full justice to the loyal bearing of the present Ministers, in having allowed the freest expression of opinion in the press on the September Act, and abstained from those measures of terrorism and corruption which prevailed under their predecessors. The essence of the speeches on the Centralist side in the dif-

* Although, as regards confidence in the present Ministry, the votes in these two Diets were as above, yet in neither were motions of addresses to the Crown, to express thanks or dissatisfaction, carried. That for the expression of gratitude for the September Act was lost by a majority of 3 in the Diet of Moravia; that to express dissatisfaction lost by a majority of 9.

† The Diet of Tyrol did not enter into any discussion of the September Manifest. It was received in silence. The Diet is not satisfied with the present Ministry on the Protestant question. It never, however, approved of Schemerling's policy.

* The Automists are anti-bureaucratic, and wish to accord a certain amount of self-government to the separate Diets. But they demand the continuation of the lesser Reichsrath as a means of liberal legislation for all the cis-Leitha countries.

ferent Diets, as likewise of arguments in the press, may be shortly expressed as follows: The central Parliament is the chief feature of the February Constitution, declared by the Emperor to be irrepealable. It had existed for five years with the sanction of the monarch, and had taken root in the consciousness of the people. Its suspension is both illegal and impolitic; impolitic as shaking faith in the word of the Emperor, and unhinging the public mind by further changes. The continued activity of the Reichsrath is therefore demanded as an acquired right (*erworbenes Recht*), since the wilful absence of a portion of the representatives of the Empire could not legally deprive those *who had taken possession of the constitutional ground* of the further exercise of their legislative functions. On the other side it has been advanced: that not in one provision of the Imperial decrees is the spirit of the Constitution to be found, but in the collective sense of all, in the Diploma as well as the Patent, viewed as an organic whole; that the Diets were originally pronounced, and have continued to be, the basis and source of constitutional life; that from these bodies the deputies to the Reichsrath were elected; that the complete Parliament had never become a reality, and the lesser body had only been exceptionally authorized to legislate on common Imperial affairs; that the suspension of the law on the representation of the Empire is no infringement, still less a repeal of the Constitution itself.

On which side is the greater weight of argument, we must leave our readers to decide. In Austria itself, opinions on the question of right are greatly biassed, as in all countries where complicated political or social questions are at issue, by particular interests and predilections. The so-called "logic of facts" may be found on the one side as on the other. The one appeals to the fact of three long sessions of a central Parliament; the other points to the still empty benches in the temporary building outside the Schotten Thor,* at the close of the last, as proof sufficient that a central Parliament, in the form which it had originally received and tried to make permanent, had not gained the approval of the far greater portion of the people of Austria.

We give a few extracts from speeches in the Diet of Lower Austria† by members who had belonged to the lesser Reichsrath, and been prominent figures on the ultra-Liberal side. They have a characteristic meaning. "The 20th of September," said Herr Schindler, "does not appeal to Austria, but to the nationalities of Austria; no one can therefore be surprised that German Austria has replied as we have done in our address" (that of the majority.) . . . Dr.‡ Berger remarked: "The firm combination, the unanimous proceedings of the German party will triumph as surely as the Monarchy can exist only on the basis of complete unity." Dr. Hofer said: "I am a member for the German city, Vienna, and will throw a little light on the German side of the question. The German element has above all things the claim (*Beruf*) to direct the State, Austria. The splendour of Germany is gone; it is become a confederation of states, which does not satisfy the hopes of the German nation. But Austria has a position in this league, and it is the duty of the German constitutional party to battle to the utmost against the suspension of the Reichsrath." Dr. Trotter, in a violent tone, spoke of "the injury caused by the suspension of the Reichsrath from the stand-point of the German question;" adding, "We Germans have founded this realm; we have sacrificed our freedom, our development, our connexion with our German motherland, for the Imperial idea. We are the only ones who place the State above the nationalities." The party to which these members belong carried an address to the Throne, not only demanding the continuation of the lesser Reichsrath as a right, but also asking the monarch—who had just declared against the whole system of *octroyé* constitutionalism—to re-invigorate the constitutional apparatus of Schmerling, and at the same time enlarge its competency by another act of Imperial power. They requested, in fact, "that in due time the results of the negotiations with the Diets of Hungary and Croatia in respect to the constitution of the whole realm" (which results, the Emperor had said, in his Manifest, are to be "laid before all the Diets for their equally important consideration") "should be submitted to the lesser Reichsrath." "This," it has been remarked in a newspaper favourable to the Government, "is the demanding as a right the continuance of a privilege opposed to right." And again, "If the present Ministers had followed in the footsteps of the former, a complete Parliament which never has existed, must have been *octroyé*, and all the nations of Austria not represented in it pronounced to be contumacious."

The Slavonic members in the Styrian and other Diets, in contrast to the ultra-Germans, if they have occasionally given more vent to their wounded national feelings and their wants, than politically wise, yet, on the whole, have only asked for even-handed justice and fair play; and many have displayed sound and statesmanlike views. They have emphatically pronounced their Austrian sentiments, their loyalty to the Crown, their desire to see the empire strong. They have asked for self-government, but without detriment to centripetal force, and they wish the power of the Austrian state to be based on harmony and mutual aid. "It is union, not uniformity we require," exclaimed a Slavonic member of the Styrian Diet.* "I am Unionist, not Centralist," said,

* The number of delegates present was usually 100 to 120 only.

† In this Diet Schmerling again took his seat, and voted against the motion for the address to the Crown.

‡ The title Doctor prefixed to names does not refer to the medical profession, but to that of the law—attorneys and notaries.

* After the address of this Diet in opposition to the Government became known, four of the members with German names, who had been elected in Slavonic districts, received addresses from their con-

too, Bishop Fessler in the Diet of Lower Austria. Indeed, not all the Austro-Germans are opposed to the present Government, or inclined to turn a deaf or supercilious ear to the requests of their Slavonic neighbours. It is the Liberals *par excellence*, who approve of race privileges, and of electoral laws favouring one nationality: who rejoice, too, at the assistance they receive from the bureaucracy. They may be sincere admirers of a strictly centralized constitutional system, worked according to their fancy, and protecting their interests in trade and manufactures, as well as in politics. The Liberalism of this party, indeed, seems to be all for home consumption, and free at least from the leaven—if leaven it be—of democracy in its larger sense. It partakes too much of the oligarchical character to suit the wants and feelings of the various populations of Austria. As a member of one of the Diets, in answer to the German Centralists, exclaimed, "The despotism of a class is just as little favourable to the welfare and development of the people as the despotism of an autocrat." In the Diet of Upper Austria one honest democrat stood forward to denounce the doings of the Centralists:—

"In the ever-memorable year '48," he said, "he had belonged to the party of the people, or rather, he had been a democrat, since the people is no party, but all, the State itself. He was still a democrat," he added, "although he had lost the ground on which he had stood, for he no longer saw the people, but only a population frittering away its strength in pursuit of separate interests. Democracy was his faith, his hope, his religion. He had not signed the proposition for an address (censure of the Government) because the motive of it displeased him. You, gentlemen," he added, "put the law above everything, and deduce from it your rights; I, on the other hand, hold firmly to the rights of the people, and deduce the law therefrom. In your time you have accepted the Constitution as a gift from the Emperor. I considered it an instalment of the rights of the people. The framers of the address should have fixed their eyes more on the populations of Austria than on the lands on this side of the Leitha. The essence of the September Manifest gave him more satisfaction than the February Patent. The former aims at a confederation of peoples (*Völkerbund*); the latter, at a separate league (*Sonderbund*). He therefore moved that the fundamental principle of the September Manifest—unity of the realm with due regard to the variety of its parts—be placed above all mere formal considerations; that the Diet await the settlement of this unity through the free constitutional co-operation of all the peoples; that at present it devote its time energetically to the affairs of the land; and lastly, that in respect to the regulation of common affairs and the representation of the Empire, the present Diet should be dissolved and a new one elected."

In that galaxy of Imperial, kingly, arch-ducal, ducal, princely, &c. crowns which are supposed to adorn, or oppress, the brows of the ruler of Austria, the Crown of Bohemia is second in importance only to that of Hungary. We therefore bestow a few words on the Diet of the first-named kingdom. Although of the entire population of Bohemia, the Czechs are 61 per cent. against 36 per cent. Germans* (the rest being chiefly Jews), yet owing to the unjust distribution of the franchise, the Czech members of the Diet are not more numerous than the German, there being about 70 of each. The Czechs sit on the right side of the House, the German Centralists on the left; the class of "large landed proprietors," numbering likewise about 70, three-fifths of whom belong to the high aristocracy and nobility of the country, form the centre. The late Ministry was supported by a considerable number of these large landed proprietors, but with the change in the Imperial policy many of them have likewise changed their views, or, from feelings of loyalty, have given their votes for the present advisers of the Crown. Thus the opposing nationalities being in equilibrium, it is the centre which has carried the address to the Emperor, expressing deep-felt gratitude for the September Manifest, and the promise to lay the result of the negotiations with Hungary and Croatia before the legal representatives of Bohemia and the other countries, &c. The German party, through their chief spokesman, Dr. Herbst, tried to carry an amendment expressing their dissatisfaction at the suspension of the Reichsrath, but failed; and, much to their surprise, the late Minister of Finance, Von Plener, voted against it.† The Presidents of both Houses of the Reichsrath have likewise seats in this Diet, and both of them spoke and voted against the address of the majority.‡ The offi-

stituents, amongst them 100 heads of communes, expressing the strongest disapprobation of their conduct in voting against the September Act.

* Of the entire area of the country 64 per cent. belongs to the Czechs, 36 ditto to the Germans.

† The "Bohemia," an organ of the Germans in Prague, takes credit for the party it represents that it did not leave the House in a body, and thus render the address impossible. A law respecting the Diet makes it necessary that more than half of the whole representatives must be present, and that an absolute majority of that portion should agree, to pass any measure. It is threatened that the Germans will render a revision of the electoral laws impossible by absenting themselves. Any alteration of these laws would require the presence of at least three-fourths of all the members, and two-thirds of that number to be of one mind. The Germans have just checked the revision of the Game Laws by leaving the House in a body on finding themselves opposed in a particular clause by the whole centre and the right! (Czechs).

‡ Subsequently Prince Carlos Auersperg, the President of the Upper House, and four other noblemen, resigned their seats in the Diet. Prince Auersperg gave as his reason some observations in the speech of Count Lazansky, the Government representative, to the effect that the suspended Reichsrath had never rested on a legal basis. These observations, the Prince said, had exposed him to the contempt and ridicule of a section of the House. Although Count Lazansky denied that his words contained anything offensive, or that any one could venture to question the wisdom and propriety of any members of the Diet, who, obeying the call of their sovereign, had been members likewise of the Reichsrath, yet the five noblemen persisted in giving up their seats, and new elections were ordered.

cials, too, in this Diet, as in those of the Austro-German countries, have for the most part voted likewise against the Government. In consequence of this, some surprise and dissatisfaction has been expressed in the Czechish press, and this has called forth satirical retorts in the papers on the German side. The Czechs are ridiculed for their inconsistency, and reminded of their own complaints in former sessions of the Diet of the subserviency of officials to the late government, to which circumstance they had attributed the majorities against their propositions. Now they should be glad to see, it is said, that Government functionaries can exercise an independent judgment. But these rejoinders lose much of their point, for the Czechs principally objected to the unfair use of Government influence under Schmerling's *régime* in procuring seats for so large a number of officials, whom they considered unfit to represent the sentiments and interests of the people. They call attention, too, to words of the late Minister for the Interior, pronouncing it to be the duty of officials to vote on all occasions with the Government. Though not approving such a general demand, yet functionaries in high position, if unable conscientiously to support a *de facto* government, ought, it is said, to resign their posts. Many of the official class, from motives of conviction and consistency, may be in opposition to the present Government. But another and selfish motive is apparent, too, for the Germanizing and centralizing policy of the late Ministry and of the lesser Reichsrath could not possibly succeed without the aid of a powerful bureaucracy. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ!* In these and other remarks on the same topic, we are far from insinuating that all Government functionaries must necessarily be deficient in patriotism and love of liberty. We are acquainted with several in Bohemia, men of high principles and enlightened views on politics, and who have at heart the public good. As a rule, however, the class of officials, by education, *esprit de corps*, and its interests, is opposed to self-government.

We must content ourselves with giving one extract from a speech in the Prague Diet—that of Dr. Rieger*—considered one of the most gifted and eloquent men on the Czech side—because in tone and argument it stands in favourable contrast to the speeches of the German Centralists, which we have mentioned above:—

Rieger expressed "his deep admiration of the wise, liberal, and trustful words of the September Manifest, which placed the final decision on the Constitution in the hands of the people, giving to no one race privileges over another. The entire population of Bohemia," he said, "without regard to nationality, ought to feel grateful to the monarch for respecting the rights of their country. Although the Czechs were different in race from others in Austria, yet they were ready to unite with all in a central council to deliberate on the more important affairs of the realm; whilst in a narrower sphere each nation could follow that path which would best lead to the development of its material and spiritual welfare. Whichever nation in this struggle for improvement should prove itself possessed of the greatest capacity and wisdom, would of necessity obtain the greatest influence. To this one a certain kind of hegemony must fall. But a hegemony of this nature was very different from one established by institutions and based on privileges. The Czechs would never rebel against a German hegemony of the moral nature alluded to, but rather accord to it a hearty recognition. But the Austrian Constitution cannot, must not, give privileges, unjust electoral laws—(great applause)—nor any institutions whereby one nation shall be artificially made to dominate over another. We demand that light and warmth be equally distributed amongst us. It is to a noble struggle that we are all invited by the September Manifest; and it is with deep concern we see in the centre of the Empire strong objections taken to the just and wise intentions of our common monarch, a refusal to tread that path which he has pointed out." He further expressed "his admiration for the results of German intellectual activity. But is it possible," he added, "that a nation which has achieved such triumphs in arts, science, and general literature, should fear to give political equality to other nations not yet so far advanced? Yet we have the melancholy fact before us. It is the small German Diets of Austria which have pronounced against the September Manifest, and rejected the hand which their neighbours have offered them in the spirit of friendship and conciliation."

On the whole, the Government may be said, both directly and indirectly, to have derived support from the proceedings in the Diets on this side the Leitha; for even the opposition of the German Centralists, it is argued, may not be altogether unwelcome to Count Belcredi, as strengthening his hands in the pending negotiations with Hungary. It must show the Ultras in that country that there is an influential party devoted to the February Constitution, and it places him in the position of mediator between

* As the Vienna correspondent of the "Times," in the issue of that journal of 27th January, has mentioned the names of this gentleman, and Count Leo Thun, Palacky the historian, &c., as having in the Prague Diet lately "recommended the use of the stick for domestic servants," it may be as well to state the facts. The Book of Criminal Law for Austria (*Strafgesetzbuch*, par. 413), says that fathers of families, heads of establishments, school-masters, &c., are permitted to punish children, wards, domestic servants, &c., if all other means of maintaining virtuous and orderly conduct fail. But corporal punishment must in no case amount to ill-treatment. In the Prague Diet a committee has lately been appointed to revise these laws for Bohemia. It left the above paragraph unaltered. Some members of the Diet, however, although unable to show that in the last eight years any domestic had been beaten in Bohemia, demanded its omission, and on being put to the vote it was struck out by a small majority. Count Thun, Palacky, &c., did not speak on the subject; but as the Diet of Bohemia has no power to alter the general criminal laws for all the Cis-Leitha countries, for the sake of uniformity they voted with the minority. This is a very different thing from "recommending the use of the stick for domestic servants"! The Vienna Centralist papers, always on the look-out to cast opprobrium on the Federalists, (stigmatized by them as Feudalists, &c.), have made the most of these votes, and it seems the "Times" correspondent has, without inquiry, taken his inspiration from those papers.

those contending for opposite national and political ends. On the other hand, it is well known to the Ultras in Pesth, that many of the Vienna Liberals have been disposed to come to an understanding with them, and to accept a Dualism as a means for the continuation of the "lesser Reichsrath" as legislative body for the Western half of the Empire, whilst the Hungarian Diet should form a kind of equivalent for the Eastern half. By this means, it is thought, the "inferior Slavonic races" could be conveniently Germanizedin the one half, and Magyarized in the other. No doubt some of the German Liberals may consider this Dualism merely as a temporary expedient, as a means to an end—viz., the realization of their favourite dream—now embodied in a stereotype phrase, "the carrying of German culture to the East." It is known that the Magyars are not a prolific race, and the celebrated Herder long ago expressed his conviction that they are doomed in the course of time to be swamped by the overflowing tide of other surrounding nations. But be this as it may, and without attributing very far reaching motives to the Vienna politicians, it is a fact that the word Dualism has often been in their mouths, and held *in terrorem* over Czech and other branches of the Slavonic race, whenever they object to their centralizing policy. Some of the German politicians, moreover, build upon the extravagance in the demands of the Hungarians, and their obstinacy, trusting thereby to get the rudder of the State again into their hands.

Hungary in every case is Austria's most immediate difficulty. In Pesth, it may now be said, is its centre of gravity to be found: it would not be wise to venture on prophecies, for however acute the vision may be as to what lies on the surface, yet events now in progress —many of the motive forces of which are hidden from the eye—may rapidly change the aspect of the scene. In so far, however, as the history of the last few years throws light upon the future, much valuable information, and a basis for sound speculation, may be derived from the work which stands fourth in our list. The author, in a style far more animated and lucid than is usual in German political writings—the sense of many of which is often choked by a plethora of words and arguments—gives a complete history of the principles and acts of a party of patriots, some of whom, as members of the "enlarged Reichsrath," were introduced to the readers of this Review in 1863. This party, called by their opponents "the Old Conservatives," has for a long time past—more prominently since the revolution of 1848 was brought to an end by Russian aid, and military and bureaucratic rule introduced into the unfortunate country—been indefatigable in efforts to maintain its politico-historical rights, and at the same time mediate between the conflicting national and Imperial demands. In the period of their country's greatest prostration and suffering, it was these men who tried to impress upon those in power how favourable was the moment for concessions to the people, which then would have been joyfully accepted, whilst the country on its part would have yielded all that was necessary for the reconstruction and consolidation of the empire. It was these men, too, who, even before the revolution, expressed the conviction—which the then aristocratic Hungarian Diet, moreover, pronounced to the monarch—"that absolute government in the hereditary lands could never agree with a constitutional *régime* in the countries pertaining to the Hungarian Crown; that this flagrant dualism frittered away the best powers of the realm; and therefore the Germano-Slavonic provinces must likewise receive a constitution." Our author also points to many occasions under the rule of Schwarzenberg and Bach, when these views were subsequently urged upon the consideration of the Emperor and his advisers. Again, in April, 1850, a party of Hungarian patriots,* twenty-six in number, including members of the chief families of the country, though warned by a person in high position "that they were playing with their heads," presented an address to the monarch, in which they courageously condemned the policy of the Government, and not only stood up for the constitutional rights of their own country, but earnestly recommended constitutional liberty for the whole empire. What these men, in their hearts as well as openly desired, was not rank or national privileges, for the Hungarian nobles, of their own accord had, in 1848, renounced the former, and acknowledged the principle of social and political progress. It is a rich and instructive chapter of history our author eloquently unrolls, and it is another proof to be added to those which the records of the past in our own country disclose, that men born to high position and wealth, and educated in the practice of constitutional rights, are often sincere and consistent advocates of true liberty and progress.

The "Hungarian" denies that the February Constitution was the outflow of the Diploma—as the party of Schmerling asserted—but rather in every essential point its very opposite. But even the Diploma, though the spirit of it was sound, and it offered to Hungary a constitutional influence over the affairs of the whole empire—an advantage it had never possessed—nevertheless took from the Hungarian Diet its positive right to vote taxes and recruits; whilst both in giving and taking it was directly opposed to the fundamental principle of their Constitution—viz., that no laws could be made or altered without the co-operation of both factors of the Legislature—the Diet and the Crown. Hungarians of no party could therefore consent to a bad precedent. "The constitutional rights of Hungary," it is argued, "are not the mere means of freedom and public good, but are the very foundation of the historical existence of the country as a State." The writer further explains and regrets the circumstances which caused the Patent to be substituted for the

* We give the names best known in England. Counts Felix, Henry, and Francis Zichy, jun. (3), Paul Széchényi, A. Barkoczy, Francis Esterházy, G. Apponyi, J. Batthyányi, E. Dessewffy, G. Andrássy, Anton Szécsen; Barons S. Josika, G. Majlath, jun., N. Banffy, &c.

Diploma, for, however the latter document displayed haste in its origin, and ambiguity in several of its paragraphs, yet, he adds, "there is no other solution of difficulties equally agreeing with the interests of the realm and the different countries, but that contained in the fundamental idea of the Diploma—viz., the united constitutional treatment of affairs common to the whole realm, with the greatest possible regard for the historical autonomy of the different countries, and for their political and national individualities." But Schmerling, under the pressure of the financial difficulties, and of the German Centralists, acted in a way opposed to the advice of enlightened Hungarians of the party we are speaking of, and evidently destined to postpone the settlement of the Hungarian question. The action of the counties (*comitaten*) after the publication of the Diploma is explained, though not justified.

"As soon as the nation saw the collapse of Bach's system," it is said, "and that it could again speak and act, the long-cherished, deep-felt, and bitter hatred of the whole people against all who had been connected with that system broke forth. The thirst for satisfaction for all the humiliations and tyranny of a twelve years' bureaucratic rule degenerated into blind rage."

Patience and soothing measures, which "the Old Conservatives" urged at that time upon the Vienna authorities, and again when the Diet was assembled, were above all things requisite. "A Hungarian (and not merely the Magyars)," says the historian of Bohemia in his pamphlet, "cannot feel happy, nor exist under a bureaucracy." "The kernel of the Hungarian institutions," he adds, "is so sound and full of vitality, that, according to my opinion, it ought to be transplanted to other lands. It contains the vigorous germ of true autonomy, without which neither civil nor political liberty can long exist, and at the same time a capability of endless reforms and improvements, without which all human institutions must fade and fall. Above all, the institutions of the county courts (*comitatsämter*) and public assemblies, on the basis of election, has proved itself a true palladium of self-government."

It was natural that a people that had been educated under free institutions should, on regaining in part the liberty of action, commit excesses; and Deak's masterly address, appealing with unerring learning and argument to the facts of history in support of the legal right of his country to independence, should have been answered in a different spirit and in a different form to that recommended by Schmerling and his associates. The Hungarians, at the time we are speaking of, knew and felt that their passive resistance had succeeded, that bureaucratic government, and collecting of taxes by aid of the military did not pay. And if more was demanded of them than the "Personal Union," which Deak made out to have been all that had ever connected their country with the other possessions of the House of Hapsburg, they should have been dealt with tenderly, and offered the equivalent for concessions of constitutional rights—a proportional voice in common Imperial affairs—in a manner and form considered legal, and agreeable to themselves. The "Hungarian," however, in his work, whilst tendering his homage to Deak, as one of the most upright patriots and greatest jurists of modern times, and admiring his masterly "*plaidoyer*," nevertheless dissents from his view that a "Personal Union formed the only State-law (*Staatsrechtliche*) relationship of Hungary to the Hereditary Lands." "According to our view," he adds, "there was just as little a Personal union as a Real union of the two halves of the empire. It was some third form of union between these two, for which in theory there is no name. It was a relationship as difficult to explain theoretically as it would be difficult to investigate the system whereby the trees of primeval forests intertwine their branches." On this head our author says:—

"The Hungarian Diet has never had any direct influence over Imperial affairs. It never fixed the Budget for the country nor the realm. In respect to Imperial loans and other financial operations, it never had a vote; and as to Customs and matters of trade in general, it is a fact that they have always been settled without its concurrence, although this was not in harmony with the spirit and particular stipulations of the laws. The right, therefore, to decide on these matters, or at least on the greater part of them, was possessed by the monarch, as King of Hungary, no less uncontrolledly than as Emperor of Austria. Consequently, the right to take part in a constitutional management of affairs common to all the countries of the realm, which the Diploma offered the Hungarians, was a thing to be accepted, and if accepted, it followed that these common affairs could not be treated constitutionally both in Vienna and Pesth, for the separate halves of the empire."

Indeed, Deak, in his first address in 1861, by admitting the necessity for a combined treatment of common affairs "*from case to case*," accepted in principle what was required, and the logic of necessity would soon have shown that "from case to case," must be a continuous affair. The patriots who held these opinions were ever ready to mediate and promote a compromise; but in vain were their efforts to teach statesmanlike wisdom to the German and bureaucratic Ministers in Vienna. The Emperor, however, seems to have always listened willingly to the Hungarian statesmen, and to have been disposed to accept any reasonable compromise with the sticklers for the letter of the law. The clause in the laws of 1848, bestowing regal powers on the Palatine, together with the demand of a separate Ministry for Hungary, were no doubt the main causes why these laws could only in part be acknowledged by the Emperor to be valid, and the chief impediment to his coronation. But these laws, in their entirety, had been passed with the coöperation of the then King,* and even the Conservatives, as well as the party Deak and the Ultras, naturally required that the continuity of historical rights should be acknowledged.

* But under pressure, at the high tide of the general revolutionary movement in the Empire!

Now that the theory of forfeiture of rights through the revolution," on which the February Patent was based, has been abandoned, and that passions on all sides have had time to subside, it is to be hoped that all classes of Hungarians may listen to the "still small voice of reason"—that the Diet will consent to revise the laws of 1848, and, for the sake of forming an important part of a powerful empire, give up so much of national independence as is necessary for the objects the present Government is striving to attain. The speech from the Throne in Pesth has been in the true spirit of conciliation, laying emphasis, however, on the requirements of the empire as a great power, and on the necessity for a combined constitutional management of affairs pertaining to the whole realm. With all due admiration of the energy* and love of freedom and law so deep-seated in the Hungarian character, yet woe to the nation if it refuse to come to terms! and if, as regards its own future welfare, no less than that of the other nations of Austria, it should entirely disregard the truth in the old adage, "*Summum jus, summa injuria est.*"

"We will not assert," says the "Hungarian," "that theoretically the laws of 1848 make it appear impossible to keep the empire together. But in practice one thing would be indispensable: that the Governments and Legislatures on this and the other side of the Leitha, should be composed of gods superior to those of the Greek myth, without passion, and all wisdom, instead of men." The draught of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, which has been laid before the Lower House in Pesth, is, like Deak's former addresses in 1861, extremely verbose. It contains fifty-eight long paragraphs. It is remarkably loyal in tone, but, in diffuse style, pleads for the letter of the law as regards the old Constitution, and demands the separate Ministry. There are passages in it, however, which seem intended to admit the thin end of the wedge of compromise, particularly as to the necessary unity in the treatment of affairs common to the whole empire. It rejects the October Diploma and February Patent, as bases of negotiation, and expresses great satisfaction that the monarch has acknowledged the Pragmatic Sanction as point of departure. The Austrian press in general, from different points of view, finds much fault with the address, which is considered by many as weak and disjointed, and the argumentation that of a lawyer, and not of a statesman. Should it be accepted in its present form by the Diet, the Emperor seems to be armed with patience, and the solution of difficulties which he so earnestly desires will probably in the end be realized. The Upper House is not satisfied with the draught, and the magnates have decided by a majority of 83 (136 against 53), to present a separate address, for the drawing up of which a committee of 30 is appointed.

We have not space to enter fully into the Transylvanian and Croatian questions. As regards the first-named principality, Schmerling's election-manœuvre has proved as ephemeral as wily, and the Diet lately assembled at Klausenberg has supported the present Government by adhering to historical rights, and maintaining the union with Hungary on such conditions as at the same time will ensure the unity of the Empire. In respect to Croatia, its relationship to Hungary on the one hand, its desire of national autonomy, and likewise to see the "integration of the triple kingdom" (Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia), on the other hand, form a combination of perplexing circumstances which can only be settled after long negotiations and disputes. Deak, in his second powerful address to the Crown in 1861, denies that in the Laws of 1848 there was any intention of injustice, or any illegality towards Croatia. In the framing of these laws, representatives of that country took part, and the Hungarians, he says, "could not think that laws which placed the Constitution of the land in the interest of justice and freedom on a broader basis, and introduced Parliamentary instead of *dikasterial* government (local courts), would not be as welcome to the people of the one country as the other." Events which soon followed seemed to prove this supposition to have been wrong. But Herr Palacky attributes the deplorable state of things in the countries pertaining to the Crown of Hungary in the year 1848, to the refusal of the Hungarian nation to accept the principle of equal rights for all the nationalities before the catastrophe at Vilagos in July, 1849, when its acknowledgment came just one year too late. And he not only blames the Hungarians in former days for their Magyarizing efforts, but in especial because, in 1860—when they got back their autonomy in part—they reintroduced their language* in all branches of the Administration, and in the schools of Slavonic districts. In no part of the Austrian dominions have members of this race been more systematically oppressed and denied the means of education in their mother tongue than in Croatia. To mention only one circumstance: Until quite recently concession has been refused for a newspaper in the Slavonic language to advocate Federalist views. The Croats have for many years past nourished a strong feeling of dissatisfaction with the Austrian Government. They have considered themselves ill-treated after the great sacrifices they made in 1848 for the Imperial House and the unity of the realm. But for the people of this country, and cognate nationalities cherishing Federalist principles, Austria would with

* The energy, however, seems to be more prominent under excitement than a constant quality. The Slavonic inhabitants of Hungary do a great deal of the harvest and other hard work in the Magyar districts. The genuine Magyar is not free from the reproach of frequent laziness or listlessness, though he is eminently gifted with the spirit of independence and the talent for dominion.

* Until the year 1835 the Latin language was used in the Hungarian Diet and officially. The introduction of the Magyar language in the Diets, courts of law, in schools, and in the parish books, caused much bitterness of feeling in the other nationalities, and was one of the causes of the civil war in 1849.

difficulty have survived the convulsions of that revolutionary year.

There is now, however, a considerable party in the Croatian Diet—though not so numerous as the independent national party—in favour of the old connexion with Hungary (not incorporation, for that there never has been). It has likewise become clear that the principle of Dualism never would have found favour in Croatia, but for the dread of the centralizing and Germanizing policy of the Vienna politicians.* In Croatia the detestation of bureaucratic rule is equally strong as in Hungary. As the Diet is now sitting at Agram, discussing and disputing with much vehemence on a variety of national and political questions—for, in addition to the connexion of Croatia with Hungary, that with the military frontier districts, and its old desire for union with Styria, Carniola, and Carinthia are mooted—it is impossible correctly to calculate the future position and prospects of the country.† One important fact, however, is patent. The September Manifest has been favourably received by all parties, and in no part of the empire is there a stronger spirit of loyalty to the dynasty.

The monarchical feeling which so strongly pervades the greater part of the people of Austria, together with the peculiar Austrian and popular‡ character and organization of the army, are main elements of the power of the empire. But another and yet more valuable element of strength may be derived from the principle—now at last thoroughly accepted by the monarch—of equal rights of the nationalities (*Gleichberechtigung*). The claims of different branches of the European races, their desire of preserving and further developing their "individualities" (as it is now the fashion to style national characteristics), is one of the most striking features of the present times. It has taken many of the older statesmen by surprise, and though when first forced upon their attention it was sneered at, yet it is now generally acknowledged that if not settled in a spirit of justice, and with due regard to existing ethnographical circumstances, it may lead to conflicts as deadly, and misery as profound, as resulted from the religious feelings and intolerance of former days. Long before 1848, many thoughtful and benevolent men in Austria, amongst whom Count Leo Thun deserves favourable mention, had taken up the question of national wants, and eloquently pleaded for the education of each people by means of its mother tongue, and in harmony with its traditions and inherited aptitudes. Views like these at first were thought Utopian, and were very distasteful to the Austro-Germans, and particularly to the bureaucracy. But, happily, men of great influence in the State, and the landed aristocracy in general, are now ready to admit the reasonable claims of the different nationalities. Still, in the countries where the races are mixed, as in Bohemia, together with much useful emulation, a lamentable amount of bitter feeling prevails. The Czechs have long chafed under a sense of oppression, and of late years have expressed their feelings, and used the liberty they have obtained in many ways most offensive to the other race so long accustomed to dominate. This bitter feeling of a long-oppressed and insulted race, though clothed in calm and earnest language, is prominent in the political essay by the historian of Bohemia; yet it abounds in sound views and reflections based on data supplied by the history of his own and other countries from early times to the present day, and it displays a true appreciation of the position and duty-call (if we may use this compound) of Austria. He enters into the idea, or *raison d'être*, of this State, and passes in review what has been thought on this head. For instance, the calling or task of Austria has been said at different periods to be—"The preservation of Western Europe from the Turks;" "the defence of the Papacy;" "the upholding the authority of the Church;" and lastly, "a spiritual conservatism in general."

"Is there at the present time," he adds, "no particular idea or task which Austria has to fulfil and develope? or is the time come when the various peoples of the empire, without common interests and objects, shall each think only of itself, and remain no longer united than the power of the sword shall decide? Various, if not always openly expressed, are the answers to this question. Many, particularly foreigners, deny the right of existence of Austria as a united realm; and because this empire for a considerable time showed itself to be the stronghold of European reaction, they consider it would be advantageous if it were dissolved into its original elements. Others, again, confess that Austria has a certain task to perform, but disagree in defining this task. Some wish to see in Austria the preserving power for Catholicism in general, and particularly as regards its eastward spread; whilst others demand that the equal claims of all confessions shall be upheld by Austria. Some say that its peculiar task is to extend German civilization and power to the East; whilst others, again, think that its special purpose is to be found at the present day—which, not without ground, is called the age of nationalities—in giving reality within its boundaries to the principle of the equal claims of all nationalities."

It is this last idea which Herr Palacky car-

---

* A member of the Diet has said: "Croatia is inclined toward Hungary, because Austria, as a member of the German Confederation, and in its efforts at centralization, is the enemy of Slavonism."

† Since the above was in type, an address of the Croatian Diet has been presented to the Emperor in Pesth. It expresses gratitude for the September Manifesto, and desires to see the interests of the country brought into harmony with those of the throne, and also of the Hungarian Crown, with which, for 800 years, Croatia has been connected. The Emperor, in his reply, whilst upholding the integrity of the Crown of St. Stephen, has laid emphasis on the requirements of the empire as a whole.

‡ We use this word in a sense opposed to an aristocratic, or mere hireling character of a military force. All classes in Austria are liable to serve. The officers are for the most part of the citizen class; a considerable portion of them rise from the ranks, and no private soldier can be tried by court-martial unless one of his own rank and a non-commissioned officer form a part of the court.

nestly advocates. And he repeats again what he said in April, 1848, in reply to the "committee of fifty" then assembled in Francfort to deliberate on the interests of Germany, and who had invited him to join them in arranging matters for a German parliament: "Truly, if the Austrian empire had not existed long already, in the interest of Europe, in the interest of humanity itself, it would be necessary to hasten to create such a State." From this conviction—though wishing success to Germany in her efforts to attain constitutional liberty and unity—he declined the invitation, and neither the abuse of Germans for his efforts to save Bohemia from their eager grasp, nor the enmity he has drawn upon himself from the Austrian bureaucracy for his consistent advocacy of national claims, have ever led him to swerve from his principles.

In the course of his thoughtful and most instructive essay, he examines the views of the Centralist, Dualist, and Federalist parties in Austria, and comes to the conclusion that only in the principles of the latter is salvation for the realm to be found. Yet the federalism he recommends for this empire must, he says, "be *sui generis*, different from that of either Germany, Switzerland, or the North American States." He would give ample power to the central government, and have a sufficient number of the *élite* of the Diets of the various lands to form a senate for the constitutional treatment of common imperial affairs, reserving, however, for the Diets themselves legislation on all matters not indispensable for unity of the empire. He rejects the two-chamber system for the central legislation, but thinks it would be advantageously introduced for the larger kingdoms and countries. "I do not care," he says, "for the outcry this will raise amongst our privileged liberals; my wish is to see not only liberal but lasting institutions, and when it can be shown to me in history that a liberal constitution with only one chamber has lasted at least twenty-five years, I will confess I have been guilty of political heresy."

In considering the wants and feelings, the different capabilities and habits of the numerous nationalities in Austria; in considering, too, the tendency in mixed populations of the stronger to oppress the weaker, Herr Palacky confesses that at one time he believed it would be good if the Austrian State were arranged in groups of nationalities whose languages are more or less homogeneous. But this idea he soon gave up, and he now adheres to the principle of continuity of historical rights, in connexion with geographical and ethnographical circumstances, as more in harmony with the wants, and more fitted to promote the future welfare of the people. In this view he is no doubt correct, for as a basis of the unity and strength of states, physical geography is quite as important as ethnography. In the spirit or essence of the October Diploma, Palacky, like the Hungarian writer, finds the true principle of Austria's weal; though, like him, he points to certain ambiguities and short-comings in that document. Much that is most valuable as regards the state of things in Austria, and suggestive as to general principles of politics and legislation, may be gleaned from the "Austrian State-idea." In that empire more than in any other, a conflict of principles is apparent, deeply affecting the welfare of society in general. We see those of self-government and centralization, the claims of strong and weak nationalities at issue. Doubtless there are advantages in strict centralization. It gives great concentration and power to the executive, introducing uniform and energetic action. But great evils and dangers, too, threaten every State which developes this principle too far.

It cannot escape thoughtful observers of our times, that there is a tendency in modern statecraft, and even in popular legislation, consciously or unconsciously, towards centralized social organization in ever increasing geographical areas. We see, likewise, that powerful states and nations are eager to absorb their weaker neighbours; for in political as in social life there is a disposition to measure the value of things by their size and quantity, and to disregard those advantages, those moral and æsthetical beauties, often to be found within a small and unpretending compass. Yet the cry of the nationalities and cognate peoples for recognition and sympathy is likewise a prominent feature of our days, and may partly be the reaction of the above-named tendencies. In Austria we find the possibility given that the conflicting requirements of the age should be reconciled, and we cannot but call the efforts of those statesmen both wise and just who approve of decentralization, and try to arrest progress in a contrary direction. If, in the course of time, such efforts are doomed to be fruitless; if, in every State, an amalgamation of races, the victory of stronger over weaker, and the spread of one particular language, be a desirable or inevitable end, yet no one can doubt that it should be attained by slow and moral means, and not by systematic oppression, causing not only a withering of national life, a loss of that charm and strength to be found in variety, but for ages to come a deep-rooted spirit of discontent. With respect to the German population of Austria, or any particular branch of the human family in other parts of the world, it may be more gratifying to self-love and the thirst for dominion to keep down other races whom less favourable circumstances have not allowed an equal degree of culture: such treatment may likewise seem to offer more palpable and immediate advantages than efforts to elevate by education. Nevertheless, not only is the love of dominion bad in itself, and opposed to moral laws, and—especially if the measures it prompts cannot be thorough—it often leads to results in the future which tax to the utmost the energies of enlightened statesmen to remedy, as we now see to be the case in regard to Ireland. The politicians of the high-handed, power-loving school overlook, too, the reaction of tyranny on the character of the nations whom they aim at exalting. Moreover, neither the religious views of the origin of man, nor the scientific theory of evolution, warrant the assumption that one or more races of man have been specially created for dominion. And as regards

European nationalities, philologists believe that their science proves the unity of their origin. If this be true, it follows of course that if some of these nationalities have degenerated under oppression and other unfavourable circumstances, they can be elevated likewise.

In Austria, till of late, the great variety of populations in unequal degrees of civilization, has favoured the absolutist principle of "*Divide et impera.*" It is to be hoped, now that it has been renounced by the head of the State, and his present enlightened and unanimous Cabinet,* it may not be adopted by favoured nationalities as a means to their ends. The Germans, morally as well as politically, through their connection with the German Confederation, occupy a vantage ground. This connexion, on the one hand, though it renders the position of Austria complicated and difficult, yet, on the other, in view of the powerful and strictly centralized States, Russia and France, to the east and west, is a source of strength and safety for the empire. There can be little doubt that the German language and the peculiarities of the German mind will gradually spread. It is impossible to conceive that all the languages of the fifteen nationalities in Austria are possessed of great vitality. Still less can this be the case with the various dialects. The ethnographical map of Austria displays 120 different groups of nationalities, and the number of language groups are said to be as many as 2000.† It seems, however, very far from probable that Austria should ever become entirely Germanized, or even that the German element should prevail in one half of the empire, the Magyar in the other. It must be borne in mind that of the thirty-five to thirty-six million population of Austria, more than fifteen million are of the Slavonic race. Although not so compactly located as Germans and Magyars, yet they are now awakened to a sense of their importance. None of the Slavonic people occupy a more prominent position than the Czechs. Their language has been highly cultivated many centuries ago, and at a time when comparative darkness prevailed in Germany. It now again flourishes through a constantly increasing literature, and it is not likely that in Bohemia and Moravia it can ever be supplanted by another tongue. Dr. Rieger has lately, in an eloquent and closely reasoned speech in the Diet, advanced the equal claims of the Czech language to be again used in the University of Prague.‡ His arguments were listened to with great attention, and have been approved by a portion of the German press. A committee subsequently appointed to report on his propositions, has decided by a majority in their favour. The electoral laws, too, of which the Czechs with ground complain, are under revision by a committee of the Diet. In the Diets of the other crown-lands of Austria, the distribution of electoral rights has likewise formed a prominent topic of discussion, and propositions for reform have in every case been met by the present government in a willing spirit. The electoral laws throughout the empire are based upon the principle of the representation of classes and interests,* and an equitable adjustment is now being attempted. Indeed, in nearly every respect the situation in Austria now presents itself in favourable colours. In every question of internal legislation and administration, not directly connected with the indispensable central power of the State, Count Belcredi stedfastly upholds the autonomy of each country. This conciliatory policy, so opposed to the bureaucratic and expensive centralization of his predecessor, is already productive of good.

Supposing, however, the improbable result, that in the end the *quæstio vexata*, the position of Hungary in relation to the other parts of the empire, should be settled by some compromise in the direction of Dualism, as some politicians advise, the future prospects of Austria would then be far from satisfactory. In reference to a Dualism, or any form of Constitutionalism not based on justice to the Slavonic race, the historian of Bohemia says: "On the Elbe and Moldau, the words *Non possumus*, may likewise be pronounced. For 1500 years, ever since the Czechish tongue was first spoken on the sacred Rip and Vysehrad, the Bohemians have lived in a never-ceasing war for the preservation of their national existence. We shall hold out as long as it please the Almighty to permit us. We may not openly rise in arms against any laws having legal validity for our country, but as long as we are free, we shall never be brought to approve of any not based on equity. Obedience we may yield, but those who desire to earn moral feelings, must deserve them." It is not merely the Bohemians, but the Slavonic race in Austria generally, that thinks in this way.

The October Diploma, and still more prominently the September Manifest, have pronounced the principle of equal rights for all the nationalities of Austria. When the Diet of Hungary shall have decided in what way the nation will be willing to forego separatist claims for the sake of forming part of a powerful and united constitutional empire, and these decisions shall

* This was far from the case in the last Cabinet.

† Kolb's "Handbuch der Vergleichenden Statistik." Leipzig: 1865.

‡ Of the students in this university in the winter 1864-5, there were 560 Germans and 813 Czechs, besides 13 Servians, 5 Poles, and 5 Slovens, &c. The professors for the different faculties were 63 Germans to lecture in their language, and 10 Czechs. Examinations for degrees are exclusively in the German language. In the Polytechnic Academy in Prague the Czech tongue, a few years ago, was placed on an equality with the German, it being taken for granted this concession would not be injurious to German interests. The result has disappointed these hopes, for whilst the Czech lectures are crowded, the former are comparatively little attended.

* There is much in the Austrian system of representation to afford instruction and gratification to English politicians not to be deterred from an examination of harmonious theories by the scarecrow "fancy franchises." Even the most "practical Englishman" may perhaps have gallantry enough not to disapprove of one form of "fancy franchise" in Austria. Women possessed of landed property in their own right have votes; and it is intended, we hear, to extend the suffrage to *independent* females in lower grades of society.

have been laid before the Diets of the other countries, for "their equally important consideration," the last word — the all-embracing, mediating, and conciliating voice—remains with the Crown. Francis Joseph has passed through a school eminently calculated to develope the intellectual and moral qualities of a ruler. Let us hope that the lessons of experience have not been lost upon him, and that he will wisely use the power which is in his hands.

ART. IV.—FRENCH OPINIONS OF THE ENGLISH.

1. *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise.* Par H. TAINE. 3 vols. 8vo. Paris. 1863.
2. *Lettres sur L'Angleterre.* Par LOUIS BLANC. 2 vols. Paris. 1866.
3. *Cornwall and its Coasts.* By ALPHONSE ESQUIROS. London. 1865.
4. *Etudes sur L'Angleterre. Réformes Sociales.* Par LUCIEN DAVESIES DE PONTES. Paris. 1865.

IT is recorded of a certain hunchback in Paris, that it was his delight whenever he overtook one of his fellow-unfortunates to tap him smartly on his hunch, and then, taking off his hat and making a low bow, to point to his own hump, saying, with a sarcastic smile, "If you are content, sir, so am I." Nations, in their caricatures of each other, have been as maliciously fond as this hunchback of rapping each other's hump, but without being equally ready to acknowledge the existence of their own. More malicious even, they will imagine humps they do not see, and treat with contempt all efforts of their neighbour to show that his back is unexceptionably straight. We once met with an amusing illustration of the persistence with which the natives of one country will fix defects upon those of another, in a German lady who desired to know if she were not right in saying that the English in general had wens. On our protesting our ignorance of the fact, she rejoined that she had been staying at some place famed for its mineral waters, and that almost all the English that went there had wens. We took the liberty of observing that there were other waters to which Englishmen resorted for rheumatism or gout; but it would be hardly fair to infer from this that the English for the most part were rheumatic or gouty. The good lady was staggered for a moment, but presently made a triumphant retreat, observing, "Ah! it is so natural to defend one's own country." It was ludicrous to be thus made to pass for an exaggerated patriot for denying that one's countrymen in general had wens. For the most part such exaggerations are not mere misimpressions, but formulas expressive of dislike. Paul Louis Courier, speaking of the proneness of the Neapolitans to calumny, illustrated it in this way; "Quarrel," he said, "with a Neapolitan, and it is quite possible he will go about reporting that you have murdered your father or mother, though it be notorious that one or the other be alive at the time; he does not care about its being believed; it is only a way he has of saying that he hates you." So with a number of the old-fashioned misrepresentations current among nations; they were simply a way they took of saying that they hated one another. But though the generation of hump-touchers and wen-finders is everywhere passing away, and in England may be considered nearly extinct, there still survives a sufficient amount of the old influence of prejudice to throw impediments in the way of a just appreciation of one nation by the writers of another.

Hence it is, that in sketching the portrait of a country which is not one's own, there is always this difficulty, that the artist is sure to bring to his work an ideal likeness from the fascination of which he cannot easily escape. It is this likeness that almost invariably makes the groundwork of the portrait he is about to take; it is this he will re-touch, re-tint, and, as far as his faculty of observation goes, will, if he be honest, endeavour to bring into harmony with the actuality before him. Sometimes the success will be considerable; but sometimes, too, the result will resemble those tales wherein fiction is founded on fact—the fact will be small, and the fiction great. This drawback upon the fidelity of delineation will of course be the more powerful in the case of two such nations as the French and English, more or less under the influence of old hostile traditions, and accustomed to see each other through a medium transmitting refracted and not reflected rays. Its action, it is true, is less vigorous on the English side than the French; for whether it is that the vast development of our power and prosperity has made us too self-satisfied to be in the slightest degree jealous of France, or that enlightened by our press and our literature in general, we are now able to recognise for caricatures what we once took for likenesses; certain it is, that England is much more capable of forming an equitable opinion of France than France is of her. We have no motive to feel pleasure at any ridicule of France; there is nothing in her of a serious nature that we envy or miss—nothing that reminds us that we have tried to do something that she has done, and failed—no consciousness of her superiority, therefore no desire to depreciate her. In commerce, in industrial energy and skill, in general knowledge, in jurisprudence, in the science of government, in literature, in discoveries and improvements, in extent of empire, in wide-spread influence throughout the world, we are content with our position and doings. This puts us into good humour and at our ease; but, above all, there is nothing in our internal relations which makes it the interest or desire of any of us to take a prejudiced view of our neighbours. Whereas, a strong reason why France cannot look so complacently on England as England upon her, and why she does not look so complacently as she ought, is, that the various hostile political sections which divide France have almost all their peculiar motives for disliking or depreciating her. The Priest party hates her for her Protestantism; the old Legitimate party, well

represented by that fine old antediluvian, the Marquis de Boissy, hates her for her democracy; the Imperialist party, for the contrast which, through her, is exhibited between liberty as a right jealously guarded by law, and liberty "*au bon plaisir*"—liberty "until further orders;" the two sections of the Republican party hate her for giving the lie to the Revolution of 1789, which pledged itself to the fact that monarchy and aristocracy are incompatible with liberty. The Orleanist party, the only one which desires a constitutional monarchy, is the only one that tolerates us, and in whose ranks are to be found our most favourable critics. It may be easily conceived, therefore, that if a French writer desires to be popular he must be wary how he acknowledges the merits of England; if he cannot honestly avoid it in one direction, he will be tempted to make some amends, even though he go out of his way for it, to discover demerit in some other direction. To praise England may be sometimes a necessity, but it is always a defect; so much so, that even the historian rushes to the rescue of great men who were in their day guilty of such weakness. "We must not," solemnly observes M. Henri Martin, in his very able and popular "History of France," when speaking of Voltaire, and his visit to England after his release from the Bastile—"we must not be astonished at, or *impute as a crime to him*, a sympathy and admiration for England, so natural for a man who, cruelly treated by arbitrary power, found himself suddenly in the presence of a system of free discussion, and government by law." Now, no human being out of France, whose opinion is worth a straw, would have dreamt of charging it as a fault against Voltaire that, when he came into the presence of English liberty, he should have sympathized with, and admired it. Were we to write a hundred folios we could not furnish stronger proof of the morbid condition of the French mind towards England than this. We must not suppose this to be a solitary instance; precisely in the same spirit, when speaking of the chapter in the *Esprit des Lois*, where Montesquieu describes the constituents of the English character, he takes care, in a note, to inform his readers that this eminent writer was infinitely less favourable to the English in his "Pensées Detachées," where he is so indignant "at their political venality, their hardness, and their egotism." Nor are we for a moment to suppose that it was the intrinsic excellence and splendour of our English institutions which dazzled him. Oh! no; we are carefully warned of our being bound to remember that when he was describing a society possessed "of the liberty of writing and *and so many other liberties*," he had before his eyes a country void of any liberty at all. "He may well be excused, therefore," says the apologetic historian, "seeing he had no living example before him of equality or virtue, for turning to that quarter where at least he could behold liberty." Not only curious, but really ludicrous, is the patronizing way in which these two eminent men are here excused for having so far forgotten themselves as Frenchmen as to do homage to England. The lesson intended to be taught by it manifestly is, that English liberty is, no doubt, a very creditable thing in its way, of exceeding good quality, and capable of excellent results, if the English people knew how to use it, and would not disfigure it by monarchy and aristocracy; but so associated, it is absurd to suppose that it could ever furnish any lesson or example of practical utility to France. Much in the same vein an historian belonging to another section of the Republican party, M. Louis Blanc, who has no opinion whatever of Montesquieu as a political writer, is quite ready to acknowledge that it was natural enough under a government lavish in its use of the Bastile, and arbitrary in divers ways, to be moved even to jealousy at the sight of a neighbouring people in whom personal liberty was a birthright for whom the writ of Habeas Corpus could fling open prison doors, and among whom grievances could appeal to Parliament for redress, or utter their remonstrances through the press. This, of course, was a brave sight; but it would be a mistake to suppose that it could do any good to France—to the middle classes, perhaps, but not to the people—for what advantage, asks M. Louis Blanc, was it to men too obscure to be subject to arrests, to have guarantees for their liberty? Of what use the liberty of the press to men who were unable to read? Montesquieu, with his English model, would be of no value to them. What they wanted, and what they got, was Rousseau. We know the results. It is, however, but just to Rousseau to say that his admirers have only taken from him what they wanted, and not all they might have had. His views were far more practical than is usually supposed. Nothing, for instance, could be more sensible and prudent than the advice he gave in his "Constitution of Poland." He there recommends the gradual emancipation of the serfs, and their being accustomed by degrees to the use of personal liberty. He indicates as the best way of qualifying them for the full rights of citizenship, first to occupy them with the discharge of municipal rights, thus giving them the experience requisite for the full enjoyment of all civil and political rights. The Americans might even yet take a valuable hint from him in their dealing with the difficult question of conferring political rights upon the freed-men. Rousseau admired Montesquieu, and had no uncompromising objection to monarchy or aristocracy. He would have been satisfied with the English form of government on the condition of its adopting universal suffrage and annual parliaments. He was no blind worshipper of the "sovereignty of the people." He even complained that the Government of Geneva had been more anxious about such sovereignty than about liberty. It is proper to observe, M. Henri Martin does not overlook these facts.

We have selected these instances to show how carefully Frenchmen, especially of certain parties, are trained to avoid the manifestation of any sympathy with England, and the expressions of any obligations to her for the example of liberty she has set. We easily understand, too, from them, how much a writer

who desires to be popular has to conform himself to this rule of abstinence, or if he deviates from it, so to do it that it shall become in the least possible degree offensive. Once aware of this, we shall not be surprised to find writers from whom we might expect better things, and who very possibly desire to do better things, showing a coyness of admiration, and a nervous anxiety to qualify their praise as much as is decently possible.

We have had occasion, in a previous number, to notice M. Taine, a man of unquestionable ability and acknowledged literary merit, the author of "A History of English Literature," in which he has displayed a marvellous acquaintance with our literature, and borne frank testimony to its merits. In doing this he was no doubt sensible he was treading on tender ground, and felt possibly the necessity of finding some counterpoise for his general praise and occasional admiration of our literary pretensions, by a certain amount of satire upon us in other respects. This, however, is principally the consequence of a philosophical theory which had led him to some foregone conclusions. The theory in question is simply this—that we can determine the specialty of any national character by considering in reference to it the influence of race, or hereditarily transmitted tendencies, the physical conditions amid which these tendencies have developed, and the characteristics of the period in which it presents itself to our notice. The theory itself may not be positively original, but the use made of it is at all events curious. Given the Englishman as we find him incarnate in his real or supposed ancestors—(it is a very wise nation that knows its own father)—the Saxons; given the conditions of climate and soil contemporaneous with their first settlement in England, M. Taine undertakes to exhibit to himself a correct picture of England and Englishmen as they now are. Having worked this out to his satisfaction, he determined to pay a visit to England, where he had the satisfaction of finding that the ideal picture was correct. Of this visit he gives us an account at the conclusion of his work.

As the climate precedes the inhabitant, he had first made an ideal sketch of that. Seen by his mind's eye, the soil in general is sodden-ed with water; for days together the rain patters on the oak trees; and overhead are dull grey clouds creeping heavily above an immovable mass of fog, while, at certain distances, the sky, at the horizon, is muddled and disfigured with rain-squalls. Here and there "a jet of sunshine falls on the tall herbs with a violent brilliancy, and the splendour of the verdure becomes dazzling and brutal." But this savage brightness is, of course, very exceptional. We shall now see how the picture stood the test. Very judiciously selecting Newhaven as the point of debarkation most in harmony with his views, he reached it under the most auspicious and corroborative circumstances. For, though it was during the fine season of the year, there suddenly burst forth one of those storms which are only to be found on the English coast. Clouds, some resembling masses of coal-smoke, intermingled with others of fleecy whiteness, distended to bursting, coalesced, and sent down sheets of pelting, pitiless rain; the swelling sea looked foul and cadaverous; the crests of the waves twisted hideously into strange shapes, while their oily and livid sides were hideous to behold. At length the air being saturated with what was really liquid fog resembling a yellowish smoke, all objects were confounded, and Nature, as it were, smeared out. "Had the Romans," he exclaims, "reached the coast in such a scene, they would have thought themselves in hell." M. Taine, on the contrary, was in heaven. The phenomena might all of them have been made to order. Landing at Newhaven, he soon found himself in London, where everything turned out according to his most sanguine hopes. Rain, nothing but rain, except fog and mud; here he really thought himself in the region of Cimmerian darkness: he even felt as if he were beyond the bounds of the respirating world, and reduced to the condition of a frog or other tenant of the marshes. The Thames with its iron boats, and their freights of gloomy passengers, reminded him of the Styx. Nothing could possibly be better. In the absence of natural daylight, too, the Cimmerians had recourse to an artificial light. For five days, for five whole days in the handsomest hotel on the "Grande place"—wherever that may be—it was necessary to have the gas burning, and this in the height of summer. Never was a theorist in such luck; fancy if he had had the misfortune to fall upon such evil days as those of last summer. But here we must pause a moment for an especial reason—to make a conjecture about the "Grande place." Leicester-square naturally suggests itself; but, for reasons worth mentioning, we suppose it to be Waterloo-place. Hence it could not find its way into his description, and here is the proof. In his notice of Mr. Mill, he cites in a foot-note that passage from the "Logic" in which Mr. Mill, arguing against the necessity of general propositions, observes, "The mortality of John, Thomas, and Company is, after all, the only evidence we have for the mortality of the Duke of Wellington." But in the text the Duke disappears, and "Prince Albert" is three times thrust into his place. It would evidently have been a breach of good manners to mention the Duke's name to ears polite; for the same characteristic reason, it would have been offensive to mention Waterloo-place.

The facts, as we have seen, having amply borne out Mr. Taine's conjectures as to the foggy and dismal side of our climate so far, he now leaves London, confident he will discover farther evidence—and is not disappointed. He has no difficulty in finding "there are still wastes in England, as in the time of the Conquest, full of rough and prickly plants, with a horse here and there feeding in the solitude. Melancholy sight!—ungrateful soil!" As he looked upon this primordial scene, his thoughts, he tells us, naturally reverted to those old Saxons—those vagabonds of the West and North—who settled themselves down in this country of marshes and mists, on the skirts of the old

forests, and along *the banks of those great muddy rivers which roll their slime into the ocean.* This was most cheering. But his picture also provided a little sunshine; he finds this too, but of rather a less ferocious character than he expected. Nevertheless, he is for a moment, in spite of himself, delighted. He falls in with a very fine day, when the air is "*semi-serene;*" and, ascending a small eminence, great indeed are his surprise and pleasure on taking this new survey of English scenery. He even describes it with the enthusiasm of an artist; the charm of our rich pastures, of our meadows glowing with wild flowers, of the rich and varied fertility spreading far and wide, and the exquisite beauty of the whole landscape bathed in a soft haze. But he soon saddens as he reflects that all here is frail, unstable, evanescent—wanting the permanent beauty of the South; that all this life is but the prelude to a swift approaching death. Moisture abounds and softens the living tissues; the plants, luxuriant in growth, are deficient in juices; nutrition is in excess, and has no flavour; the moisture procreates, but the sun does not perfect. But then there is plenty of grass, plenty of cattle, plenty of meat. Plenty of opportunity for great feeding and for gross feeding; and this is what the human machine in England requires. We must here notice, to the honour of the meat we eat, that it forms an important item in the estimate formed by French writers of our intellectual as well as physical characteristics. A brilliant French historian, for instance, M. Michelet, having in his "History of France" asserted that the Northern nations were indebted for their energy of mind and body to the fact of their being great flesh-eaters, finds a very remarkable proof of it among the English: "Their great genius, Shakespeare," he says, "was the son of a butcher." It makes one tremble to think what might have been the result had he been the son of a market-gardener! As the enormous consumption of flesh forced upon us by the moisture of our climate produces in us a type of animal intelligence very different from what we suppose we must call the vegetable intelligence of Southern countries, so, of course, does it in its peculiar way fashion our bodies. And here again, "observation confirms history." When M. Taine first introduces our ancestors as settling themselves in our lugubrious country of commons, and marsh, and rivers of mud, with occasional jets of sunshine revealing a violent brilliancy and brutal green, he thus presents them to us—"Great white bodies, phlegmatic, with blue eyes, light hair tinged with red, voracious stomachs, crammed with meat and cheese; heated by ardent spirits; a cold temperament; not precocious in love; fond of their fireside; and inclined to brutal drunkenness." * These were the characteristics of our first national parents; and these, we are assured by our distinguished philosophical critic, are still the fundamental characteristics of Englishmen. Look at an Englishman: the scaffolding is solid, but clumsily put together; when an idea gets into his brain, it does not run out as in some nations by the arms and fingers, in the shape of gestures, but remains there until it wants to act,—hence he can always act calmly, as the motive power in him is an idea or watchword, not an emotion or an attraction. He can attend meetings, get very hot, and end without a quarrel; abuse to any amount his Government, but not assail it; he may possibly risk reform, but never revolution. That this may be our present condition we are not indisposed to admit, and if it has been brought about by meat and moisture we are very grateful to them; but we do not very clearly see how it happens that these invaluable conditions of our existence having always been present, our history should be so gorged with violence, periods of incessant civil war, and riots on a most leguminous scale. Indeed, revolutions, and tolerably grave ones, are not unknown to us. But now let us see what M. Taine says regarding our physical characteristics. These are his words:—

"Examine the passers-by in the streets, you will see all the traits indicative of their temperament; light hair, among the children almost white; eyes of a pale blue, like china, red whiskers, lofty stature, automatic movements, together with other striking peculiarities, which highly-nourishing food and a life of energetic action have superadded to this temperament. Here the enormous life-guardsman, fresh-coloured, majestic, well-made, flourishing a small cane in his hand, expanding his chest, and displaying the well-defined parting in his pomatumed hair; there the big over-fed man, thick-set, florid, looking like a fatted ox, with a restless, yet stupid, inert look; a little further on the country gentleman, six feet high, big and burly of frame—as of a German issuing from his forest—with the muzzle of a bulldog; wild-looking whiskers, out of all proportion; rolling eyes; apoplectic face; here you have the extreme results of coarse and over-stimulating nourishment. To this add, what is even common among the women, a white frontage of carnivorous teeth, and large splay-feet, solidly shod, admirably adapted for walking in the mud."—Vol. iii. p. 636.

Such is the valuable confirmation of his theory which M. Taine derives from personal observation. It is lucky for us, therefore, that we have a gentleman among us as the correspondent of a French official paper, the *Moniteur de Soir*, who, not writing under the yoke of a theory, is actually telling his countrymen that red hair and beards are not more plentiful here than elsewhere; that one is quite in despair at not meeting noses of the parrot-bill form, or my Lord Puff and John Bull rolling along painfully under their traditional corpulence; and that Englishmen are a robust, well-grown, and good-natured looking set of people. But let us

* Our contemporary, the "Edinburgh Review," is indignant at the *sera juvenum Venus* which M. Taine has taken from Tacitus, and proudly refers him to any English magistrate for better information on this subject. M. Esquiros was very much surprised to find that light eyes and hair, and fair complexions, were decidedly in a marked minority, and that his own observations bore out Dr. Pritchard's estimate that not more than twenty per cent. of the population in England were light-haired and fair-complexioned. Sad facts for M. Taine.

get back to M. Taine, who is always worth hearing; passing from the parents to the children, who have not yet absorbed so much moisture and consumed so much flesh, the impression upon him is less unpleasant. Our young cricketers please him, their eyes beaming, if not with intelligence, yet with life; pictures of health, activity, energy, enterprise — looking, many of them, like "handsome greyhounds in full chase." He notes, too, the fondness of young Englishmen for athletic sports, and how, under that necessity for absorbing moisture which is essential to their being, they love to swim, to row, to course over the moist meadows, to breathe in their boats the salt air of the sea, and—here we confess we do not exactly know what is meant—"to feel on their foreheads the rain drops from the great oaks." Lord Bacon, indeed, was wont to say that he liked to walk out bareheaded in a summer shower, for it made him feel as if the spirit of the universe was descending upon him. We suppose that this too may be explained by the theory of absorption, and that it is cognate with this juvenile love of the rain-drops, in which there also may be something unconsciously devotional, resembling, in spite of the difference between the meteorological and dietetic conditions of the two nations, the worship among the Romans of Jupiter Pluvius. Looking to this intense desire for absorbing moisture, fresh, salt, to say nothing of alcoholic, it is to be regretted that M. Taine has not attempted to account for the universal use of that remarkable instrument, the umbrella, among us. It may be fairly a question with him whether this phenomenon, in conjunction with the increasing use of waterproof materials, india-rubber over-shoes, and other prophylactics against wet, together with our extensive system of drainage, may not indicate some change in our temperament, and imply that we are entering into what hereafter may be called our "Dry Period." Having finished his sketch of our youths, M. Taine approaches our English girls. They fairly rout him. This is his cry of rapture:—

"Nothing more simple than the young girls; among lovely things there are few so lovely in the world; well-shaped, strong, sure of themselves, so thoroughly sound and open, so exempt from coquetry. Impossible unless one has seen it to imagine this freshness, this innocence. Many of them are flowers, flowers just bursting into bloom; only the morning rose with its pure and delightful tints, with its petals studded with dewdrops, can give an idea of it; far in advance this of the beauty of the South, with its distinct, finished, fixed outlines, constituting a definite design; here all reminds us of the fragility, delicacy, and continual flow of life; eyes full of candour, blue as violets, looking without consciousness of what they are looking at; at the slightest emotion the blood diffusing itself over the cheeks, the neck, even down to the shoulders, in purple-tinted waves; you see emotions flitting on these transparent flushes like the varying tints that play upon their meadows; and this virgin purity is so genuine that you feel an impulse to lower your eyes in respect. And yet all natural and artless as they are, they are not languid and listless; they enjoy and can bear active exercise like their brothers; with their hair floating in the wind, they are to be seen, when only six years old, galloping on horseback, and taking long walks. In this country a life of action fortifies the phlegmatic temperament, and the heart becomes more simple while the body is becoming more sound."

Ah, young ladies! if you had not before you the prospect of the white frontage of carnivorous teeth, and mud-adapted feet, of which you have lately heard, your delight and triumph would be complete. But be of good cheer. M. Taine can sometimes be an observer; only he is under the necessity of showing that gloom and rugged energy are the characteristics of the English nation, and this leads him often to exaggeration, and occasionally to caricature. For an instant you have emancipated him from his theory, and he yields to an influence which the artist who has come over here to paint us after life, M. Lacaut, informs us has established a current phrase in his language, "*jolie comme une Anglaise.*" Very soon himself again, M. Taine proceeds to sketch what he says is the essential type of the Englishman. To do this he plants himself with the characteristic belief of a Parisian that the capital is the country, on the platform of a London terminus, and notices the absorbed, careworn, concentrated look of the travellers hurrying to and from their daily avocations, their features rigid, faces pale, eyes fixed, deep in thought, their mouths partly open, and at the same time contracted (like the state, we presume, of incipient whistle); men used up and stiffened by excess of toil, they go on without looking right or left; their whole being absorbed in one object, work, work, profitable work; in a word, mere machines. This is dreary, but we shall be apprised by-and-by that this veritable type is but a partial one. Meanwhile, he notes—and here it is not very possible to caricature—that squalid population, dirty, ragged, and begrimed, for ever crowding through the worst quarters of our capital, paying their tax to the great law of absorption in the shape of gin, crowding together in filthy lodging-houses, or outraging humanity in casual wards. We must acknowledge this is a spectacle which may well arrest the attention and shock the feelings of foreigners. That these grim personifications of human wretchedness—these hapless tenants of the slough and slime of cities—may have a deeper dye of external wretchedness here than elsewhere, is possible, but that they abound too in other capitals is certain, and it is there they have acquired the name of "dangerous classes." How often have we had descriptions of those sinister-looking men and women, who at the approach of tumults in Paris issue from their dens and lairs, and who, never seen at other times, make their appearance there as hideous harbingers of the coming storm? Whence do they come, and how do they exist? A stern police sweeps them from the streets; no love of publicity tracks them to their haunts. But whatever be the case elsewhere, it does not lessen our responsibility for the mass of undoubted wretchedness here, and which seems to present itself as an impregnable bulwark to our benevolent efforts to amend it. And while rejecting the baseless theories of foreigners as to its

cause, it is well we should be stimulated to fresh exertions by the reproaches which are showered upon us in consequence of its results.

Having thus given some idea of the sketches which this brilliant theory-hampered, but really able writer, has drawn of us as animals, it is but justice to him, as well as to ourselves, to give some idea of the impression which the works of these singular creatures have produced upon him. But we must first premise that the Englishman is no longer the primitive Teutonic animal of whom we have the disagreeable picture in the frontispiece; he is that animal carried onwards and developed; "his body and mind have been transformed by stimulating food, by physical exertion, by religious austerity, by public morality, by political contests, by incessant effort." In the whole world, declares M. Taine, there is no greater spectacle than that which is presented by his work; and never in any nation, ancient or modern, has there been such a mastery over matter; industrial and commercial London; Liverpool with its miles of docks and warehouses, its forests of masts and fleets of merchantmen; Manchester, and other manufacturing towns, with their vast and various processes, and the energetic industry of their operatives, astonish him. Nor does the rural life of England escape his notice; his brief animated sketch of it, and of our farmers and peasants, is in some particulars too favourable. "If you examine," he says, the "peasants, they are not real peasants; they in no degree resemble our rustics—a sort of fellahs attached to the soil, suspicious and uncultivated, separated by a vast chasm from the inhabitants of towns. The English peasant," he justly observes, "stands to the soil in the same relation that the operative does to a mill; for the farm is in reality a factory, and the farmer an overlooker. Men embark their capital in agriculture as do manufacturers and speculators in industrial enterprises; nobles and gentles make it their glory to do so. Hence marvellous results; with a soil poorer than that of France, the acre yields double the quantity of produce. In England, thirty labourers will produce twice as much as forty laborers in France." There is no dismal colouring here; and if we follow him in his charming description of the houses and cottages of these farmers and labourers we shall find in general that his colours are too bright; but there is considerable interest in it, as implying a very different condition of things in his own country:—

"Enter a farm, a moderate one, of a hundred acres for instance, you find well-behaved, worthy people, well dressed, expressing themselves clearly and sensibly; a spacious house, healthy and comfortable, with frequently a small porch in front, covered with creeping plants; a garden well attended to, ornamental shrubs, the walls inside white-washed yearly; the floor-tiles cleaned once a-week; a cleanliness everywhere that is almost Dutch; besides this, a tolerable number of books, travels, agricultural works, or religious, or historical, but above all, the great family Bible. Even in the poorest cottages are to be found objects connected with comfort or gratification: a large shining grate, a carpet, almost always walls papered, one or two little moral stories, and invariably the Bible; the cottage is clean; there is manifest evidence of order; rows of dishes, with blue patterns, ornament the dresser; the red tiles carefully swept; no broken or dirty windows; no doors or window-shutters half off their hinges; no stagnant pools or reeking dung-heaps, as amongst our villagers; the little garden is kept clear of weeds; rose-bushes sometimes, and honeysuckles climb about the door; and on Sunday the father and mother are to be seen seated at a nice clean table, with tea and bread-and-butter before them, enjoying their *home*, and the fruits of their orderly arrangements. With us on Sunday, the peasant leaves his cabin to go and see his *landed property;* his great object is possession; what the former aim at is comfort."

To be sure, after drawing this rather high-coloured picture of the well-being of our rural labourers, he makes amends to his readers by informing them that this love of the comfortable, the disease of the whole country, is their especial misfortune, one of them having supplied him with the rather remarkable information, that "our peasants, the moment they scrape together a little money, buy the best sherry and the finest clothes."*

But what principally strikes him in our rural districts is the public spirit of our landed proprietors, and the energetic support they give to every species of improvement in their respective localities; indeed, his picture of our aristocracy is extremely unlike that which modern Frenchmen delight to draw; unlike other aristocracies, he sees them marching in the van, not lagging in the rear of civilization. They are no drawing-room "delicacies," like the marquises of the last century. He notes, too, what may be called the democratic feature of our English aristocracy—its being constantly recruited from every other class, through the accumulations of wealth effected by industry and merit; or, to use his own peculiar way of putting it, the best plants of the great popular forest are, from time to time, transferred to the aristocratic arboretum, thus enriching and popularizing it. In fact, in the same way that a French soldier is said to have a "bâton de maréchal" in his knapsack, so may it be said that every Englishman has a coronet in his pocket; and this it is which preserves our coronets. Another important feature in our organization does not escape him. What he looks upon as chiefly constituting the coherence of English society, and contributing to its harmonious action, is the facile acceptation of the relative positions of superior and inferior, which is found from the top to the bottom of the social scale. In this he is right. Whether it be the effect of old institutions or any peculiarity in the temperament of our people, or of an instinctive tendency to organization, inducing us to regard faithful service as honourable as high command, certain it is, that while there is no people more jealous of their personal independence, there is none more indifferent to social

* He has evidently mistaken something he has heard touching the recklessness of our operatives, who, as is well known, or may be learnt from Mr. Smiles' admirable paper on "Workmen's Earnings, Strikes, and Savings," are but too frequently open to this censure.

equality. An Englishman, though ready, if required, to lead, is much less anxious to lead than to be *well* led.

M. Taine has a word to say of our clergy. It is easy to see at what he points when he tells us that the village clergyman is not the son of a peasant, unpurged of his rusticity, full of the seminary, shut up in a monastic education, separated from society by his celibacy, and half belonging to the Middle Ages. On the contrary, he finds in him a man of the times, who has improved himself by reading, and still reads; if he does not keep pace with men of free thought, he is not far behind them. "Even you, modern man as you are," he says, addressing the Parisian, "may converse with him on all the great subjects of thought, there is no impassable chasm between him and you; properly speaking, they are as much laymen as you are, the only difference is, that they are superintendents of morals." This will be wonderful news to the Parisian, and is certainly a little too strong. We can easily understand the effect produced upon him by the contrast between the French clergy and our own; and though we fear that a very large proportion of the latter are not quite so expansive as he describes them, yet it is happily beyond doubt that there are agencies at work by which, in a few years, the exceptions to his encomium will be very considerably decreased. It is possible that there are many who, acting under a professional compulsion they are not yet able to resist, may be bolder in thought than act; but we are afraid that if M. Taine could witness their weak and captious proceedings on the great educational question, or the solemn gravity with which numbers of them embark in the childish ritualistic controversy, he would ask to revise his conclusions.

But we must have now done with the impressions of this clever, eccentric, exaggerating, but not malicious critic. The only marvel is they should be attached to an elaborate and masterly survey of our literature instead of finding a place in the *feuilleton* of a newspaper; but as he tells us himself, they are introduced as confirmations of a theory, and we know what a theory will often bring a man to. Besides, he allows us as much excellence as our necessity of humid absorption, and excessive flesh diet, combined with a phlegmatic temperament derived from those curious looking Saxons, who (with the exception of a slight Norman cross) he really believes were our forefathers, will admit; nor will our self-love be much offended at learning that we are wanting in the higher grades of abstract intelligence, and utterly so in those qualities which bestow a capacity for the fine arts, when we come to learn that these are the perquisites of a drier temperature and a vegetable diet. We may console ourselves, indeed, with hoping that, by contrivances akin to those known to horticulture, by which we successfully procure the soil and temperature necessary to the development of exotic plants, we may one day, by means of artificial climate, and properly adapted food, train up English artists who shall be equal to the production of the beautiful in art; and English philosophers, who shall be able to ascend to that lofty region of abstraction from which so many unperceived blessings have descended upon mankind, and to which other nations are indebted for that immensely superior intellectual development so well known — to themselves.

It is a prodigious comfort to pass from M. Taine to M. Louis Blanc—from a style brilliant, animated, often eloquent, but excessively surcharged, disfigured by overwrought expression, coarse illustration, and grotesque words, to one of a purer stamp, clear, lively, epigrammatic without effort, eloquent without strain, vigorous without coarseness, copious without redundancy, reminding us of what French was before its modern corruption. As we read M. Taine, we are apt to think of what Montesquieu said of the epithets of Jean Baptiste Rousseau: "They say much, but they always say too much, and constantly express more than they say." As we read M. Louis Blanc we are reminded of the classic days of French literature, ere ambitious writing changed the easy movement of a graceful runner into the sparkling feats of a ballet-dancer. It is now some time since the latter of these writers was giving us, in an admirable work in our language, the correct version of those political events with which he was connected in 1848, and which dissipated so many unfounded prejudices against him. He now appears as the author of "Letters upon England." The title is not well selected; they are rather letters on passing events in England; they are what Horne Tooke inappropriately called his work of research, *επεα πτερεοντα*—winged words freighted with the suggestions and inspirations of the moment, as they jostle, succeed, and displace each other in the great centre of political intelligence. Had the descriptive studies of M. Esquirós been in the epistolary form they would really have been letters upon England, agreeable in style, admirable in spirit, extensive in survey, replete with details, and accurate in execution. We may observe that his recent volume on Cornwall contains a large amount of agreeable and useful information respecting a most important but outlying county, which not being a thoroughfare, is comparatively unknown to the rest of England. It is well worth perusal. But to return to M. Louis Blanc. In a conversation with a friend, prefixed to his letters, faithfully representing, we are quite sure, his scruples, he states his objections to accepting the responsibility of publishing a series of disconnected communications, written in his capacity of correspondent to a Parisian newspaper; the result, therefore, of momentary impressions, imperfect inquiry, hasty appreciation, and thrown, the greater part of them, into the post without being revised. His friend having overruled without, it seems to us, having answered his objections (that of going forth unrevised was certainly a grave one), we are bound to give M. Louis Blanc the benefit of the admission, that his work goes to the public entirely unrevised, and that there may be wrong judgments in it, which he has not had the opportunity to correct. But of this we may be sure, that nothing

will be found in it intentionally incorrect, nor aught set down in malice.

In accepting the post of correspondent to a new newspaper, which by its prudence, good sense, and well-tempered liberalism, has shown itself worthy of the distinction, M. Louis Blanc, while paying France the compliment of saying that she fascinates the world and sets everybody thinking of her, ventures to regret that she should so exclusively concentrate her thoughts upon herself. Like a brilliant coquette, it would seem, she sits with nations full of admiration at her feet, without deigning to cast a glance upon her worshippers, though offering, as we are told, their homage in every shape—hanging on her words, trying to divine her thoughts, and ever straining their ears to hear what she says in her waking dreams when she happens to talk to herself aloud. To arouse her from this habit of self-contemplation and self-converse, M. Louis Blanc playfully reminds her, in the language of that wittiest of abbés, Galiani, "that what distinguishes man from other animals is, that he is the only one that has the faculty of meddling with what does not concern him." But surely his countrymen have been extremely human in this respect. So thought at least the Baron de Lisola in that famous satire—for which Louvois gave orders to have him kidnapped dead or alive—in which he had the impertinence to suggest that the practice of the French was "to foment disorders within nations; that their maxim is to thrust themselves into all sorts of affairs right and left, and to play the part of arbiters everywhere, by force or address, by threats or kindness;" that their "genius naturally tends to war; ardent, restless, fond of novelty, desirous of conquest, prompt, meddling, and lending itself to any kind of expedient it thinks conducive to its own ends;" that "it requires fuel for its fire, and if it cannot find it without, it will try to find it within." If this be true, it may be that what M. Louis Blanc represents as worshippers may be anxious watchers. That there is truth in it is admitted, with much courage and candour, by a writer who, in various forms of historical research, is endeavouring to give useful instruction and warning to his countrymen. M. de Witt, who, in his interesting notice of Louvois (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, Feb. 12th, 1862, since published separately), says, in allusion to Lisola's description—

"Modern France has sometimes boasted of having nothing in common with ancient France. Here, however, is an old portrait, in which, even at this day, we recognise a certain family likeness. It is not flattering, and — Heaven be praised! — there have been times when it has ceased to be like. *It has become a little more so of late. I even know people who wish that the resemblance were complete!*"

Vastly important is it, then, that a nation not indisposed, if this be true, to mix herself up with the affairs of other people—to impose upon herself what she calls a mission, for one purpose or other—should break down that wall of ignorance within which she confines herself, listening to hymns in her own praise, of her own composition, and let in that outer knowledge which will acquaint her with the character of other nations, and supply her with valuable criticisms on her own. It is, no doubt, through the foreign correspondence of our leading newspapers, written from different points of view, correcting each other—subject of course, by the very nature of its composition, to convey much information which is superficial and unsound, but with much more that is valuable and accurate—that we have accustomed ourselves to take a pleasure in descriptions of other countries, neither sensational nor satirical, commending themselves neither by ridicule of them, nor by flattery of ourselves. Our business now is to inquire how this amiable and very able correspondent of the *Temps* discharges his task of explaining England to France. We select what he says of Englishmen in general, premising he only speaks of us in a public sense, and that his letters have little to do with what may be called the private and inner life of the nation. The opportunity is furnished by his twenty-fifth letter, entitled "L'Angleterre avant tout," England first and foremost. The occasion was this: Mr. Roebuck in a speech at Sheffield, in August 1861, had just declared that to his certain knowledge, the French Emperor had made a compact with the King of Italy, in virtue of which Sardinia was to be handed over to him, as soon as he should withdraw his troops from Rome. As was natural—and as it appears to us, as was just—there was at Sheffield, and throughout England, a universal cry of "Shame, shame!" M. Louis Blanc, who has no kind of respect for the Emperor, but a sensitive admiration of France, was scandalized. The surprise of England at so mean a conclusion to so great a programme —its indignation on hearing that a policy that came so proudly forward in the shape of an idea should be taken in the act of opening its palm to a valuable bribe—was so great that M. Louis Blanc inferred that she would soon ring with protests against such an act. He hastens at once to encounter them; he assures his countrymen that, do what they will, England will not go to war, and that they are therefore at liberty to take what course they like. And as to the moral value of her reproaches, this was not of much moment, for it was simply the well-known case of people seeing the mote in their neighbour's eyes and overlooking the beam in their own. For what policy has ever been more indifferent to justice than the English? Where has cupidity ever pounced with less scruple upon its prey? England no doubt, under the "yoke of aristocracy," has done many noble things; her laws have been mindful of man's dignity; she is the only country where the political exile is sure of hospitable refuge; but, as an ambitious power, she has been rarely arrested by any scruples. Having hurled this terrible *tu quoque* at England for things she might possibly say if a certain thing should occur, he proceeds to show from what it is this strange inconsistency in the English character arises. He had luckily stumbled upon a man who, as a type of the Englishman, would explain it. It seems that during the election of

1859, some Palmerstonian candidate, alluding to our Chinese policy, said, "If we have begun by being unjust, we should go on with being unjust." M. Louis Blanc suppresses the name; why, is inconceivable to us, because, as we shall presently see, it is really no manner of reproach to him. For though not all Englishmen would be quite so "frightfully" frank in the expression of this sentiment, yet it expresses the national instinct, more or less, of all of them. But we are warned not to conclude that the speaker in question is not in all the private relations of life unexceptionable. On the contrary, it is quite possible he says his prayers regularly, goes to church, and makes his servants do the same, as the English fashion is. For it must be known that in almost every individual in this country there is a sort of "dualism" of a very curious kind. Take, for instance, an English gentleman—he is a capital fellow; know him, and you must like him; sympathetic, firm in his attachments, generous without ostentation, and just in all his dealings. But let anything arise to endanger the "material interests" of his country, his whole nature changes, what was before wrong becomes right; and this man, so full of justice a moment ago, quietly tells you that he respects no law but that of force. Now it must be explained that M. Louis Blanc, when expounding this theory of dualism, solemnly warns his readers that he is not reasoning from the particular to the general, but that after a very long and very impartial observation, he has come to the conclusion that there is in each of the inhabitants of this singular island "two perfectly distinct beings—the man, and the Englishman." The first, as we have seen, is a highly respectable person; the latter, is obviously a great knave. This is singularly annoying and inconvenient, because, when the "Englishman" does a dirty thing, the "man" is defiled by it; or, if the former gets into a scrape, the latter, though having no share in it, is obliged to smart for it; and if it leads to a war, the hostile bullet, though animated with the best intentions, cannot possibly confine itself to the real offender. But is it true? Well, there is some truth in it, which in England we express in a more intelligible way. We say that men will often do in their collective capacity what they will not do in their individual capacity. The difference between the two modes of statement is that ours is of more universal application, including all men, Frenchmen as well as Englishmen, and that it does not as absolutely affirm that they will inevitably do this, but that they are very capable of doing it.

The Baron de Lisola, in that censure that nearly cost him his life or liberty, would, no doubt, have made precisely the same distinction as M. Louis Blanc does in his censure of Englishmen. But it is extremely imprudent, under any theory, to take an individual expression as the representative of a national one. It happens, while in the act of writing this, we receive M. de Boissy's extravagant tirade against England. Now, what would be thought of the correspondents of our newspapers if, starting from this speech as M. Louis Blanc does from that of the nameless speaker, they should follow precisely the same course of reasoning we have been considering, and apprise England that, though as men the French are amiably disposed towards us, yet, as Frenchmen, they are bent upon our destruction. This would the more easily be credited in this country, because there is a very general feeling that the Emperor is really the chief guarantee of peace between the two nations. How indignantly would M. Louis Blanc repel such conclusions, yet the only difference between theirs and his would be, that while theirs might be the result of momentary irritation, hasty assumption, or mischievous purpose, his—for reasons we shall presently explain, and which we will thoroughly excuse him—are the results, as he himself indicates, of old and deep conviction. But first let us see to what extent these convictions carry him.

In his remarks on Mrs. Beecher Stowe's letter to Lord Shaftesbury, complaining of the lukewarmness of England towards the North, he censures the Federal Government for having, in the first instance, declared it was making war to maintain the Union instead of abolishing slavery, thereby "furnishing to England the pretext she required for her egotistical policy;" this policy, be it remembered, being simply a persistence in a complete neutrality towards the contending parties. This is tolerably strong, and might, one would have thought, have been deemed sufficiently disagreeable. Nevertheless, M. Louis Blanc proceeds thus:

> "I say the *pretext* (the italics are his own), for I am compelled to avow, and truth commands me to do so, that the actual attitude of England in reference to the American question, proves, in fact, according to what Tocqueville remarks, that whenever two causes come into collision, that will be the just one to the English which best serves their interests."—Vol. i. p. 189.

That this is extremely offensive, to say nothing of its being grossly unjust, is manifest. But it is unquestionably the result of profound conviction, and it is only the power of this conviction, overcome for an instant and then resuming its sway, that can explain how it is that a man of undoubted ability and honour, generosity and kindness of feeling, should have fallen into such strange inconsistencies as those we are about to note. It appears that the French newspaper with which M. Louis Blanc corresponds, had remarked that the first impression produced by the seizure of the *Trent* had been one of great irritation, and that all the more for this, when the first impression had subsided, did the attitude of England appear grave and dignified. M. Louis Blanc fully endorses this opinion. The cry through the press, he writes, is, Let us not be precipitate; let us carefully examine if we are in the right; if the law of nations is not for us let us patiently submit to it, as becomes a strong nation; if it be in our favour let us ask for reparation, and if refused let us enforce it. It is impossible, he says, "to imagine nobler language, or a really prouder attitude than this. He is delighted to see a free people exhibiting such a spectacle to the world. But he

asks if there be any reason to be surprised at this, and he thus replies:

"No, sir. There, in fact, where public opinion is sovereign, where each man throws his weight into the public balance, where what is the interest of all, is the affair of all, it happens, and must necessarily happen, that each citizen ceases to consider himself as responsible to himself only for his passions and his thoughts. What more calculated to elevate the soul than this feeling of high responsibility universally diffused!"

Remarkable language this after what we have just read. It would never, without proof, be believed that it was from the same pen that a few pages before had described the English in their collective capacity as knaves, and placed such an abyss between them in their private and public capacity. What now strikes him is the identification of the individual with his country; not the transformation of himself into something else for the advantage of his country, but a sense of his personal responsibility to it as regards his own feelings and thoughts, tending to produce that elevation of national character which accounted for the dignified position of England at that moment. Here again he is sincere, and, for an instant, just. His genuine joy at seeing a free people doing such honour to their freedom, for a moment broke the spell that binds him, but only for a moment. Before he had concluded his letter it was beginning to resume its sway; and a fortnight after —the death of Prince Albert claiming his attention in the interval—we find, on his returning to the affair of the *Trent*, that it has again completely mastered him.

He had by this time persuaded himself that there was in England a wish for war with America. "England," he thus begins his letter of December 22nd, 1861, "desires war . . . the demon of war has conquered men's minds and souls; generally speaking it is looked for with impatience, it is invoked, it is wished." This being the supposed state of general feeling, M. Louis Blanc proceeds at once to state the motives for it. We give them, italics and all:

"For a long while the English have been desirous of depressing a powerful rival; for a long while they have been shuddering at the sight of a power developing itself on the other side of the Atlantic, and developing, too, on a gigantic scale, the rival of its own; for a long while they have been disquieted by the growth of the merchant service of America; for a long while the English aristocracy" [this is always the villain of the piece] "has been suffering from the splendour of institutions that are its condemnation. As long as the United States were united, the attack might have been dangerous. . . . . *At length the golden opportunity has presented itself; the English have the wind in their favour, and they say, 'Let us seize the propitious moment without a minute's delay—who knows if it will ever recur?'*"* —Vol. i. p. 298.

Are we reading a melodrama? Is it possible that the same people who, a little while ago, were setting such a noble example of calm self-restraint; such deep reverence for law; such noble anxiety to discover wherein lay the right; such an attitude of dignity and forbearance, as well became the children of liberty; is it possible, we repeat, that such a people should be so soon described as being capable of a cowardice and premeditated baseness which would disgrace the most paltry nation in the world? But how, then, are we to account for such a judgment by an able and conscientious man? For reasons some of which are connected with the political school in which he was reared, and some which have a more personal relation to himself. From his boyhood to the moment of his leaving France M. Louis Blanc has been a political writer, receiving the inspirations of that Republican party in whose mouths "Perfide Albion" has been ever a bye-word, and who, agreeing with the Legitimists in a hatred of England, differ from them, however, in this, that while the latter detested England in spite of its aristocracy, they detested it on account of its aristocracy. Republican France had notified to the world that aristocracy was incompatible with national greatness, and to admit that such greatness was the characteristic of England—according to them, exclusively ruled by an aristocracy—would have involved the unpardonable sin of denying the infallibility of that mighty oracle. Schooled after this fashion among the straitest of his sect, M. Louis Blanc sought refuge in

* This insinuation about finding an opportunity very seasonably brings to mind two most scandalous sets of correspondence which—though it appears they could not be discovered by previous writers—M. de Witt has been able to get at and append to his admirable work on Jefferson; (we noticed a translation of this work under the title of "Jefferson and the American Democracy," in a previous number.) They relate to the policy of France with respect to the dissensions between England and her American colonies, and present a strange commentary on what the Emperor of the French has lately called "a *noble page* in the history of his country." It is perhaps the most ignoble one. We think we may take for granted there does not exist in the world a statement so disreputable as that which the Count de Vergennes, under the title of "Considerations," laid in 1766 before the King. Beginning with a regret that France and Spain were not at that moment strong enough openly to render the resistance of the Americans as desperate as possible, and thus to avail themselves of an "*opportunity of reducing England to the condition of a second-rate power*," he proceeds to advise that they should covertly attain the said end by secretly assisting the insurgents with military stores and money, while dexterously keeping the English Ministry in a state of false security with respect to their intentions. But no extracts can convey a full impression of the infamy and cowardice of the conspiracy which French statesmen were anxiously entreating Spain to engage in with them for the purpose of ruining England by giving aid to her insurgent colonies. The recommendations were forthwith, as we know, acted upon *secretly* by France, as suggested, while the power of the resistance was yet uncertain, and *openly* when it gave pretty certain promise of ultimate success. All that the Americans have to be thankful for is that France, in her desire to ruin England, fancied that she had found the opportunity in making them independent. This correspondence should be carefully read. See, too, Martin, "Hist. de France," vol. xvi. p. 412.

England, flying from a country to which, in her hour of peril, he had proved himself a friend, and which, the danger passed, turned fiercely on him as a foe, on account of theories which, absurdly and wickedly misrepresented, were made to appear fatally hostile to her *material* interests. But it may be argued that his long residence in England should have modified his views; and so it has where they could be modified by palpable facts. The following extraordinary quotation, taken from his "Organization of Labour," will show the gloomy dreamland in which his mind received its early impressions respecting the character and pursuits of the British aristocracy—that is, of those whom he was taught to believe shaped our destinies according to their will. After paying the permitted compliments to English liberty, and acknowledging the value of many of her institutions, though reared under a "*crushing aristocracy*," he proceeds to show how these aristocrats, after appropriating to themselves a very large share of the spoils of the world, are beginning to receive the moral chastisement of their crimes:—

"The riches of these great lords," he says, "leave them a prey to I know not what sort of vague melancholy—a malady which God sends for the mighty ones of earth to bend them down under affliction—affliction, the terrible lesson of equality! What, in fact, do these proud lords feel in the midst of their enjoyment? Bitterness of thought, and eternal disquietude of soul! It is with reason they fly from their foggy island, and go forth to scatter their ill-gotten gold in other parts of the world, where they may be seen dragging along the burden of their miserable wealth."

It is obvious that when a man has been, for a great part of his life, under the influence of such nightmare conceptions as these, he may well be pardoned if he exhibits some traces of them through the remainder of his existence, however long that may be. Let us see, then, to what extent he has been able and willing—for this is the capital point—to divest himself of them in the presence of the facts. In his seventy-eighth letter, "*La science sociale à l'étude*," suggested by the meeting of the Association for the Promotion of Social Science, he speaks of the important support it receives from members of the highest aristocracy. On which fact he remarks as follows:—

"This is characteristic of the English aristocracy, and shows wherein lies its power. Far from opposing itself systematically to progress—as our ancient French nobility did, which remained entrenched in its old prejudices as in a fortified castle—the English artistocracy watches progress so as to turn it skilfully to its own use. Scarcely any questions of utility or interest to the people with which some great name is not mixed up. Is it a question of schools for the indigent?—of sanitary measures in districts inhabited by the poor?—of shortening the hours of labour of women and children in factories?—of diffusing education?—the names of the Earls of Shaftesbury and Carlisle, of Earl Grey, Lord Stanley, Sir John Pakington, Lord Brougham, &c., present themselves as a matter of course. Is it not a striking thing that personages thus occupying the very summit of society should be induced to descend into the depths of the social system, and visit them lamp in hand?"—Vol. ii. p. 91.

Now look on this picture and on that; the former sketched by a man still under the training of French ideas; the latter, by the same man escaping from this thraldom into the presence of the facts. But it certainly does honour to his candour so fairly and fully to report the results. It is true, that when he comes to regard the aristocracy as an element in our foreign policy, his early impressions revive, but this is to be traced to the same cause that makes it impossible for him to look upon that policy itself with a favourable eye. As far as these two points are concerned, he has not yet had time to escape from them. During nearly the whole period of his residence here his time and attention have been absorbed in his "History of the French Revolution." He has been living in the past, and that past the never-to-be-forgotten and the never-to-be-forgiven period of "England under Pitt." As the enthusiastic advocate of that event, he has been dwelling apart from the world around him, and missing no opportunity which, according to his prepossessions, may enable him to bring into strong relief what he considers the perfidy of England, and the nefarious policy of our aristocracy. It may fairly be questioned whether this long habit of looking at the foreign policy of England from one, and that a strongly prejudiced point of view, will ever permit him to be an impartial critic in this respect. But however he may misjudge us, he will not malign us, and it would be perfectly unwarranted by anything he has said if we were to suspect him of any desire to do so. For we must remember that our foreign policy has been reprobated by one who is a great admirer of our English institutions, and who is never tired of extolling them to his countrymen. It is true, he does not represent us as worse than other people in this respect. He indignantly condemns the charge which makes England the only or the chief criminal in this matter. "Her policy," says the Comte de Montalembert—for it is he of whom we have been speaking—"has been neither more egotistical nor more immoral than that of the other great states of history ancient or modern. I am even of opinion that it would be quite possible to prove that it has been less so." And having said this, he has the courage to assert that we might in vain search "into the darkest corners of English diplomacy to find anything that distantly approximates to the destruction of the republic of Venice, or the tricky affair of Bayonne." The difference between the two writers is this, that while the latter looks back on French history with the critical eye of a statesman who sees something in it to admire, and something to deplore, the former is thinking only of the first French Revolution, which he regards with the devout admiration of a worshipper for whom it has the character of a sacred event. To undervalue any of its articles of faith is the most unpardonable of heresies; to have embarrassed its progress, or combated its pretensions, is the darkest of political crimes.

Hence it is that, to his mind, completely under the fascination of that event, England has to pay the penalty of having been "England under Pitt," and to be appreciated—as far, at least, as her foreign policy is concerned—under the bias of associations which are too strong to be suppressed. We may easily conceive, therefore, that all his letters referring to our relations with America are one continued censure of the acts and policy of this country. Consequently, when we have satisfied ourselves that this argues no ill-feeling, but is a matter of course, they may be passed over without additional notice. They will possibly come back to us from America as "the testimony of an impartial foreigner." Hence it is to be regretted that these hasty impressions were republished without being revised.

It is much pleasanter and more profitable to meet him in his lively and clever letters having reference to our internal politics, to instances connected with our jurisprudence, the action of our laws, our charity, and our pauperism, our fondness for exhibitions of physical strength or activity (as that of Blondin, for instance), the characteristics of our leading statesmen, and a variety of topics all vigorously as well as gracefully handled, and enriched with appreciations always interesting and very generally accurate. Among the lightest of them, none is more agreeable than his account of the Derby day. The impressions he received would make poor M. Taine shudder with horror. He bids all those who believe that the English are "a grave, cold, phlegmatic people," come and see the mad follies of "the road," with its exuberance of life, its excess of merriment, and thorough debauch of joy. On this subject at least he is one with M. Montalembert, who has also borne the same testimony to our "Isthmian games," but who is especially interested in the fact that such immense numbers of people can be gathered together, enjoy themselves at leisure, and disperse—a vast number of them in a paroxysm of mirth—without being under the paternal protection of an armed police, quite capable of amusing, as they govern, themselves without help. Among the subjects which engage M. Louis Blanc's attention are "strikes," the evils of which he has pointed out with great force, and which, as coming from a man whose whole life has been devoted to the improvement of the well-being of the working classes, ought to have great weight. Another opinion of his will surprise those who only know him as a thorough-going democrat—namely, that though believing implicitly in both the justice and expediency of universal suffrage, he does so with the proviso that it should be exercised under special conditions. In allusion to certain manifestations in America, he says:—

"Why mince the matter? The constitution of the United States, whatever be its other merits, is defective in this respect, that in recognising the power of majorities it has omitted to subordinate it to that action of permanent control which is needful to every species of power, and to that of majorities perhaps more than any other. Many people believe that the sovereignty of the people is realized by the government of the greatest number, whatever may be the mode in which this government is organized, or by which it performs its functions. For my part, I cannot, I confess, conceive a more dangerous error. Sovereignty cannot be a sum in addition. What really constitutes a nation, what makes its grandeur, what creates its power, is what it comprises of capacity, experience, reason, and enlightenment. The putting into motion these living forces in the interest of all, this is its sovereignty; and if universal suffrage merits our acknowledgment of its excellence, it is because, under certain given conditions, it furnishes the best process that can be employed for committing the management of public affairs to the most efficient and worthiest hands. A democracy in which the force of numbers has the effect of nullifying the force of intelligence, instead of entrusting it with the direction of affairs, is not a democracy; it is but a multiform despotism, blind and confused—a despotism inevitably condemned to perish, a little sooner or a little later, by self-destruction."

Of the evil which he thus strongly indicates he had experience in his own country, an experience confirmed by what he sees in the United States, where "the most eminent minds are precisely those which do not find their way into the national representation, and which live apart from official life." Whence, according to a remark of Mr. John Stuart Mill, which he endorses as most just, "Political life in America is a good school, from which the ablest professors are excluded." These admirable remarks, it must be remembered, are suggested by the acts of that real universal suffrage which is the basis of American institutions, ever at its work, and not by that fictive suffrage which in his own country expired in the act of granting a *carte-blanche* of privileges in perpetuity to the government of its own creation. Of that anomaly there can be but one opinion, unless it be among those who find it to their unenlightened interest to entertain another.

There is one comparison M. Louis Blanc makes between England and France, which has a certain interest at this moment, when it is asserted respecting us that we do not sufficiently permit ourselves to be guided by abstractions, or, as they are called, ideas:—

"France," says M. Louis Blanc—"and it is this which makes me proud of belonging to my country—is perhaps the only country in the world capable of loving truth and justice for their own sake, independently of the result. Nothing of the sort here. Between the English mind and the Absolute there is an impassable barrier. This country is eminently the country of the relative."

This is pretty much in the same strain as that in which Mr. Arnold, in a recent article in the "Cornhill Magazine" that has attracted much attention, makes certain foreign critics, to whom that gentleman pays the profoundest deference, deliver their oracles. For our own part we do not see much in it; but if the distinction really exists we think the English have decidedly the best of it, seeing that we are to live in the relative and not the absolute. A man who can indulge his organ, as Tucker and Gall would call it—or his instinct, as philosophers generally call it—of Justice and Benevolence by lying on his back and admiring it, is surely less usefully en-

dowed than him who, to gratify it, must be upon his legs applying it. It is not considered an enviable quality in a miser that he can love gold for its own sake; and as little enviable it seems to be to have the power of valuing truth and justice for the mental gratification they bestow upon ourselves, instead of exclusively valuing them for the benefits they confer upon others. Besides, as inventors too often learn to their cost, what a difference there is between pure and applied mathematics, so are legislators painfully aware how frequently that is false in practice which seems true in conception. M. Louis Blanc has himself, when prefiguring in the first volume of his "History of the French Revolution," the course the revolution has to run, shown the consequences of endeavouring to govern by abstractions. There will, he says, be a "fanaticism of ideas;" we shall see a wrathful, surging multitude, surcharged with every manner of irritation, following men of impassible countenances, heedless of all the turmoil around them —the very "heroes of abstraction." He tells us also the result. There will be "the vehement and concentrated worship of a principle; intelligence so excited as to become the most tempestuous of the passions." "This," he adds, "constitutes the originality of the French Revolution." No doubt. And this is the reason why it will never be copied, and why able men of liberal ideas are at this day in France vigorously protesting against its excesses and mistakes, and endeavouring to extinguish a morbid admiration of it that has been fatal to French progress. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that some of Mr. Arnold's foreigners declare it to be the glory of the French Revolution "to have produced and embraced the idea—the work of making human life, unhampered by a past which it had outgrown, natural and rational." Here we confess we were perfectly in a mist; we knew, indeed, something of its being "unhampered by a past," inasmuch as one of its devoted admirers declares that its capital defect was breaking off with tradition and suppressing time; and that in consequence, what his countrymen have to do is to renew their connexion with tradition, and, as it were, to retrace their steps in time.* Beyond this we could get no farther; and right glad were we at last to learn that the thing meant to be indicated was what is known as "the greatest-happiness-for-the-greatest-number-principle:" a more comprehensive view of which, albeit a homely one, was taken long before the French Revolution by Henry IV., when he wished that every peasant in his realm could have a fowl in his soup-pot. In fact, this grand principle seems to be involved in the meaning of that very commonplace word, civilization — implying a process which, as far as we know, is of a far earlier date than the French Revolution. Nevertheless, Mr. Arnold's foreigners are positively certain we are coming to grief from our stupid attachment to facts. They even point to results. Some of them, in the person of that great European authority who is to the imagination of this age what the Great Mogul was to the imagination of a past—the "Prussian official"—has delivered himself as follows—"It is not so much that we dislike England as that we despise her." This is very frightful indeed. Others, again, represented by that great military authority, a "German Officer," criticising the Crimean war, observe, to Mr. Arnold's great content, that in spite "of their courage the Russians were beaten by the French, and EVEN by the English and Turks." Here the logic of events explains and convinces. The Germans have always beaten the French, the French have always beaten the English—*ergo*, "EVEN." Then again, others, in the guise of one of those great leaders of the European press—a German newspaper—discussing territorial changes, say, "England will probably make a fuss, but what England thinks is of no consequence." So they can rob at leisure. Then, again, they are personified by one of the gravest and most moderate of French newspapers, which, displeased at something we had done respecting a Cholera Commission in the East, grandly says, "Let us speak to these English"—mark how finely contemptuous!—"the *only* language they comprehend. England lives for her trade; cholera interrupts trade—therefore it is for England's interest to join in precautions against cholera." What a mighty and terrible thing is Continental wisdom hissing through a French newspaper! But all this degeneracy and stupidity, and ignorance of even the only one thing we can understand, trading, comes, as we have intimated, of our vile addiction to facts. We did extremely well in the past, say Mr. Arnold's foreigners, because we worked through an aristocracy; and as all that the past wanted was facts, and that an aristocracy is good for nothing else but working out facts, and that excellently, we could do all that was desired. But the day of facts is over, for they belong to the past; and the day of ideas has come, and ideas belong to the future. Here, again, the atmosphere is getting misty. Is it meant that the facts of the past were independent of ideas, and that the ideas of the future are to be independent of facts? This would be pretty much as if any one should say, Hitherto we have been directed by bodies without souls, and henceforth we are to be directed by souls without bodies. We had supposed that a fact had always belonged to the past, the present, and the future; that its origin belonged to the past, its immediate action to the present, its consequences to the future; we had fancied that in the past there had been facts pregnant with ideas as great in their results as any we can conceive likely to be developed in the future. In Europe generally, the Crusades and Feudalism, and the Reformation; in England, Magna Charta and the Revolution of 1688. If Mr. Arnold's foreigners would in plain language tell us what they mean, it would simply amount to this, that it having been the custom of all illustrious foreigners, from time to time to predict the impending decay of England, and having lost faith in the old signs of her ruin—such as her national debt, pauperism, &c., they are obliged to abandon the world of facts, and to betake themselves into that of metaphysics, in order to discover the elements of her approaching ruin. Hence much

* M. Martin, "Hist. de France," vol. xvi. p. 674.

unintelligible talk about aristocracies as only fit for the past, when facts were to be disposed of; * and middle classes and other classes which, not equally adapted to administer facts, are henceforth to administer ideas, to the great advantage of foreigners who have a very fine turn for ideas, and to the great detriment of Englishmen, who are entirely devoid of it. We can only hope that when Mr. Arnold next opens his show-box his illustrious foreigners will be of a somewhat higher stamp than a Prussian official, a German officer, and a brace of editors, German and French.

But we must warn Mr. Arnold to take care how he makes his personages speak. He reminds us it is well "to see ourselves as others see us;" so it is; but not always by reason of the instruction we get touching ourselves; sometimes for the information it supplies regarding those that see us. A man, for instance, comes with all the earnestness of conviction, and tells you you are—a squirrel. You get no instruction about yourself, but a good deal about him. You don't believe that you are a squirrel, but you are perfectly certain that he is mad. Mr. Arnold can easily deduce the moral.

But though it is no grief to us to be told that in our minds there is a chasm between the absolute and the relative, yet it is not pleasant to be informed that we can hate poverty in the abstract though we cannot love truth and justice, and that this hatred of poverty shows itself in the relative by the ill-usage of the children of the poor, to whom it is acknowledged we are so kind. We are really an unlucky people, always getting into the wrong. This last peculiar view of us is illustrated in one of M. Louis Blanc's letters, entitled "L'Enfant du Pauvre," occasioned partly by an article in a weekly paper deploring an instance or two of those preposterous sentences that now and then are passed by stupid magistrates on juvenile offenders, partly by an incident we must give in M. Louis Blanc's own language:—

"Some eight days ago I was crossing Kensington Gardens; suddenly I heard shrieks. I ran to the spot whence they came, and found one of the keepers who, with a thick cane, was severely beating a child in rags. Was the little wretch's offence, perchance, that of having dared, in the uniform of misery, to intrude into so fine a garden? I did not stop to inquire, but did what every one would have done in my place—I tore the victim from the executioner. The rage of the keeper was so great that he was about to turn upon me, when I said to him, What! are there not laws in England for the protection of animals? At these words, of which he comprehended all the severity, and which took him by surprise, he stopped short."

It is possible that this little victim in the "uniform of misery" had been committing some of the wilful damage that is occasionally committed by the members of his corps, and it was thought better to chastise than to send him before a magistrate. It is possible, too, that the sensitive and compassionate nature of the observer exaggerated to itself the degree of severity used. But at all events, as it was to be made a point of, it is unlucky that M. Louis Blanc did not communicate the fact to the proper authorities, either directly or through the obvious medium of the *Times;* he would then have had an opportunity of ascertaining whether our laws for the protection of animals do not include little bipeds in rags as well as "monkeys and dogs;" he would have been spared, too, the necessity of wishing that the anxiety which, in England, is felt for the child of the rich, should manifest itself "a little" for the child of the poor man—at least as far as this illustrative incident could suggest such an idea. It is to be regretted that, while praising in the warmest terms the munificence of English charity, his attention should not have been directed to the abundant evidence of its special application to the children of the poor. He has himself noticed the laws forbidding the overworking of children in factories, and commanding certain hours to be set apart for their instruction. Fortunately, a French writer, the late M. Lucien Davésiés de Pontès, in an essay which, by its fulness and accuracy of information respecting our pauperism, past as well as present, and the various efforts made to relieve and diminish it, exhibits evidence of patient and judicious research, has led his countrymen to a very different conclusion. This is his testimony:—

"A principle" [he is speaking of our legislation respecting ragged and reformatory schools] "pregnant with consequences has thus been consecrated by English law, and applied in all the cities of the kingdom. *Society adopts the child which poverty leaves without education and helpless.* Civilization repairs the evils which it brings in its train, or which human imperfection entails upon it. Out of an army of malefactors and enemies England makes a nursery of artisans, sailors, soldiers, labourers, who will augment the defensive and productive forces of the mother country, or go forth to increase the population of her colonies—perhaps to found new ones. While satisfying in the highest degree the demands of charity, the enactments in favour of industrial and reformatory schools guard against the most formidable contingencies engendered by her superabundant population. By qualifying for the duties of social life the masses that at some future day will find no room on an over-peopled soil, England regulates and stimulates her capacity of expansion, enlarges and makes usefully available the paths of the future." *

* It is curious enough that while we are, on one side or the other, twitted about our aristocracy, it should so happen that among the thirty-two or thirty-three names attached to the remarkable amendment to the Address in the French legislative body asking for more liberty, twelve should have titles attached to them, and two or three more belong to aristocratic families. How do Mr. Arnold's illustrious foreigners explain this?

* We are glad to find M. de Pontès' essay cited by his countrymen as an authority, as, for instance, by M. de Montalembert, and we cannot but regret that he has not lived to continue his useful task, so ably executed as far as it has gone, of conveying accurate information to his countrymen respecting England and its institutions. A considerable portion of this volume is devoted to the subject of "Woman in England," and presents a very effective sketch of

This, as we see, is a very different picture from that so hastily sketched by M. Louis Blanc. Much more to the purpose is the latter's eloquent lament that, as yet, the means are not attained of relieving unavoidable poverty without inflicting suffering—that in order to aid those who are unable to work, or who are unwillingly unemployed, from the impossibility of getting it, we must surround them with restraints necessary to repel the merely idle—that we must "introduce into our workhouses an iron discipline—that we must put a bar in them to all the gratifications of family affection, because they would inspire too much contentedness—that we must separate the husband from his wife, and the children from their mother—that we must transform charity into a chastisement, and treat poverty as a crime." All the more sorrowfully does M. Louis Blanc look upon this supposed terrible necessity, because it is the profoundest of his convictions that this immensity of misery, involving such almost insuperable difficulties in its management, will be avoided by the extension of that co-operative system of which Southey long since predicted and hailed the approach, which is now in this and other countries demonstrating its value in practice, and receiving its recognition from men of the largest and most practical intelligence. Deeply is it to be regretted that, with all his earnest zeal in this cause, he has not been permitted to promote and superintend its extension in his own country, where, as we learn from M. Casimir Perier (*Les Sociétés de Co-operation*), absurd obstructions are still thrown in the way of its free development, of which the English operative has not even a conception, and which make it impossible for such a society as that of the Rochdale Pioneers to exist in France. Meanwhile he is still at his post expounding England to France; and it is for this reason that we have warned by showing him the results of certain "idols of the mind," which obstruct his judgment and expose him to a misconstruction which it is most desirable he should avoid. But it is possible that his energies and his talent may soon find work on his own soil. A few years ago, when the French Emperor offered his amnesty, one among the most honourable of the refugees here, M. Schoelcher, declined it with the observation, "It is true the door is open, but I will not enter it *until I see the word 'Liberty' inscribed over it!*" It would almost seem as if that inscription were on the point of being begun. The remarkable speeches of M. Thiers and M. Glais-Bizoin seem omens in that direction; especially the former's, who, cool and wary, would hardly venture to be bold if the hour for courage had not arrived. But if liberty be regained, how will it be preserved? M. Thiers has remarked, that there are but two free nations in the world—the one a monarchy, and the other a republic. The great instruction of this lies in the fact, that both these countries are peopled by men of a common physical, intellectual, and political ancestry; these men, divided into two great sections, have been able to work out liberty under different forms. The obvious inference therefore is, that the charm is not in the forms, but in the men; and that where liberty is really in the heart or in the temperament, it will work itself into action under any forms.

We have confined our observations principally to two writers of mark, looking from different points of view, who, in spite of friendly feeling and many appreciations of us that are fair and just, do, nevertheless, illustrate the eccentric and old-fashioned notions of us that still minister to the delight of France. There are others writers—as M. Perefixe Paradol, for instance—who, in incidental notices suggested by the political events of the day, are conveying to the minds of their countrymen an estimate of our institutions and character framed under no predetermining theory, conceived in a broad and liberal spirit, and exhibiting a careful and accurate study of our public history. The opinions of these writers merit a separate consideration.

her past and present social position, and very judicious views concerning the position to which she may fairly aspire in the future.

ART. V.—THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION AND THE SECESSIONISTS.

1. *The Life and Public Services of Abraham Lincoln, Sixteenth President of the United States.* By HENRY J. RAYMOND. New York: Derby and Miller.
2. *The Constitution of the United States of America.* By W. HICKEY. Philadelphia, 1854.
3. *Bacon's Guide to American Politics.* London: Sampson Low, Son and Co.
4. *The Presidential Message, Dec. 4, 1865, of Andrew Johnson, Seventeenth President of the United States.*

A TRAVELLER landing in America for the first time has much difficulty in forming a true idea of the political condition of the country. The first impression is that of so much confusion, of such a Babel of meetings, of speeches, of pamphlets, of papers, of such an endless variety of party names, often amusing and always puzzling, that it is no easy task to form a sound judgment upon public affairs. It is not only the diversity of opinions which embarrasses the stranger, but also the violence with which Americans frequently give utterance to those opinions. It is not merely the animosity of parties which strikes him, but equally the vehemence of the attacks often directed against the President and his Cabinet, against the highest authorities, civil and military.

Sometimes the elections, always warmly contested, appear as if they would end in a general overthrow; and be it borne in mind, that they are of such constant occurrence as to seem both endless and perpetual.

Every man forms upon every subject his own views, to which he gives full and free utterance.

In the railway may be seen the labourer or the artisan conning over his paper with evident relish. If spoken to he will give his opinion upon political subjects without any hesitation. He will discuss freely the policy of the President, the last despatch of the Secretary of State, the proposition of one of the senators, the tactics of a general, or any other matter of public interest. He minces neither his praise nor his blame, as the case may be; for he considers himself as one of the sovereign people judging men of the people's choice. If a stranger from the Old World should hint that he would do better to attend more to his own work and less to politics, the American's wonder at such an idea would change quickly into something like pity for his foreign fellow-traveller, in whom he would see but a poor serf of feudal Europe, which he pictures to himself as in the last stage of decrepitude.

As to the contents of American papers, whose name is legion, the result of their perusal upon the newly-arrived stranger is that of confusion worse confounded. One journal paints the character and policy of the President and his Cabinet in colours so black that they might be supposed, without any great stretch of imagination, to be monsters of scarcely human origin sitting in the high places of Washington, itself little better than an earthly pandemonium. Another draws these same personages in characters of beatific perfection worthy of angelic messengers directing a federal government in possession of a terrestrial paradise. Should the stranger reasonably conceive both of these pictures somewhat overdrawn, he will find at every turn writers and speakers who represent every shade of opinion which can possibly lie between these two extremes. He has only to choose; but there lies the difficulty.

Yet this very country, the surface of whose public life presents so much apparent confusion and disorder, has just traversed victoriously one of the most terrible crises to which a nation has ever been exposed. It has presented to the world the marvellous spectacle of its people going through the great political contest of a presidential election in the midst of a civil war which threatened the very existence of the State—a war which covered with vast armies an extent of territory the size of half Europe, which cost tens of thousands of lives and millions of money. The national laws and liberties have, notwithstanding, survived intact. Generals in all the prestige of victory, commanding numerous and disciplined armies, have respected the Constitution, and bowed to the authority of the civil power. During the war the people continued to discuss public affairs. Elections, campaigns, expeditions, defeats, victories, followed in rapid and constant succession, but the final result was the complete victory of the United States Government, crowned by a moderation of which history offers but few examples. What was the cause of this result, so little anticipated by the enemies of the American Republic? Whence sprang that deep devotion to the Federal Union which led the majority of the nation to lavish upon its Government the means for crushing the violent attack upon its authority?

One of its chief sources is the love of his country's institutions which the American drinks in from his earliest childhood. That love is inculcated equally at home, at school, and at college. It plays a most important part in the educational system of the United States of America, constitutes in a great measure their strength, and produces results of vast importance to the country. In order thoroughly to appreciate the extent of its influence in the formation of the national character, it is necessary to touch upon the leading features of this system of public instruction. Spreading itself over the length and breadth of the land, it embraces all classes, from the richest to the poorest, throughout the whole of the Northern States. In the South it has not received the same full development, and has been far less generally encouraged. It is worthy of remark, that the Federal Congress at Washington has absolutely nothing whatever to do with the system of education—a most singular and abnormal fact according to the ideas prevalent in European countries. It is, indeed, the exception when the legislature of a particular state interferes in the matter of schools. In new States, however, where the population is still scanty, the legislature of the State sometimes aids by grants of land or money. To the township belongs the real management of its popular instruction. In each township a Committee of Education is elected by the inhabitants, which votes and levies the money destined to this object; to it belongs the regulation of all details, such as the erection and maintenance of the school-buildings, the appointment of masters and mistresses, their salaries, the selection of school-books, and the method of instruction to be followed. Another marked feature in the system is the absolute prohibition of all denominational religious teaching—that is, of all doctrinal or dogmatical instruction characteristic of any particular church. That general morality which is common to all religious denominations is alone permitted, but all dogmas are forbidden. In many, perhaps the majority of schools, the Lord's Prayer or a psalm is read daily at the opening of the school, but it is not allowed to make this practice the occasion for giving religious instruction. The school committee of the township decide whether or not such a practice is to be followed in the schools under its authority. The object of this exclusion of all dogmatic teaching is, to avoid the innumerable difficulties arising from difference of religious views; the questions which spring from such difference creating almost insuperable obstacles to the establishment of a really effective system of national education. All such difficulties are thus got rid of. The religious instruction of the children is left exclusively to the parents and to the Sunday schools. These latter are completely in the hands of the various religious bodies, all of whom are wholly unconnected with the State, and entirely supported by the voluntary contributions of their respective members.

As to the quality of the instruction given under this system of public education it may be said, without exaggeration, not to be surpassed in excellence by that of any country. The greatest attention is paid in the teaching of those elementary matters which lie at the foundation of all instruction, and which form by far the most difficult part of education; the tender age of the children, and the great simplicity of the primary notions to be taught them, requiring all the tact, gentleness, and patience of which the teacher is capable. Nor does the care thus taken at all fall off in the instruction given to the elder pupils. So deeply have the native-born Americans become convinced of the excellence of a sound education (especially throughout the Northern and Western States, where such a feeling is universal, and where the school is ever one of the first buildings erected in a new township), that the greatest punishment which can be inflicted is that of forbidding a child to attend school during a given time. The little culprit usually gets punished at home for having allowed matters to reach such a climax. Parents or friends will come to inquire whether the punishment was really merited, and beg to have so severe a sentence remitted, or at least mitigated.

One of the subjects to which especial interest is attached in the schools of the United States is the history of their own country. The principles upon which the Government is founded, and their practical application, are carefully inculcated. Not only is this subject taught in all its details, but the effort is made to impress the pupil with the utmost love and admiration for the institutions of the Republic. The starting-point is naturally the story of American independence. First is stated the origin of the resistance of the colonies to the mother country. Then it is shown that this resistance was not a mere capricious act arising from no particular cause of complaint, but that it originated in a legitimate opposition to certain illegal proceedings of the Home Government, which exceeded its powers by taxing the colonists although they were wholly unrepresented in the British Parliament. Thus the English Government violated the principle of that inseparable union between taxation and representation which forms the basis of all constitutional liberties; nor did numerous and repeated demonstrations of the most lawful character, such as public meetings, protests, and petitions, avail to turn the Home Government from its unconstitutional policy. It must not be forgotten that the Americans are supported by very high authorities in accusing the then English Ministers of pursuing a course opposed to the principles of their own Constitution; for in England's Parliament three of the most eminent statesmen of the day—William Pitt (Lord Chatham), Edmund Burke, and Lord Rockingham—protested against the acts of the Home Government. Pitt and Burke pleaded the cause of the colonists in Parliament with great eloquence and unanswerable arguments. These facts are carefully recalled by the Americans, who draw from them strong evidence in support of their cause. This point established, they make every effort to demonstrate the excellence of their own institutions. They dwell especially upon the wisdom, patriotism, and political knowledge displayed by the men who gave to America her actual Constitution; placing ever foremost the honoured name of Washington.

Youth is generous: nothing is easier than to make it admire that which is constantly held up to it as great and noble; it is therefore easy to imagine how immense is the effect of the teaching just described. It is yet further increased as the youths of America grow up and realize the vast resources and the ever-increasing wealth or their country. This system deposits and developes in the hearts of all classes an affection bordering upon idolatry for all that relates to their native land; but such a result is not without its defects and drawbacks. From it arises an exaggerated pride of country, often displayed by the American when away from home. He is apt to boast unbecomingly of his own country, and speak of other nations and governments as quite inferior to his own. If, on the contrary, the European travels in the States, this same feeling has a very different effect, and is not unfrequently the source of much kindness and hospitality. The American is delighted to be questioned as well as to question. He willingly explains everything, and points out whatever is most worthy of observation. He is the most indefatigable of cicerones and the kindest of hosts. The traveller gives him real pleasure by studying the institutions of the country, and has every opportunity afforded him of doing so thoroughly. Proud of his country's system, and deeply attached to it, the American delights to see others examine carefully that which he so fondly loves himself. Let it not, however, be supposed that this love of country, excellent as is that feeling, is the only source whence springs that friendly hospitality which is so freely offered to the stranger in all parts of the United States.

These feelings had grown with the nation's growth, and were handed down from father to son. They were especially strong throughout the Northern States, where the national educational system has received its full and perfect development. Thus it was that up to the memorable year 1860, the Constitution had ever been regarded as the sacred ark, so to speak, of the Republic. To touch or change it, except by those legal means prescribed by the Constitution itself, was to commit a veritable sacrilege. It was worthy of notice how both individuals and parties sought in their discussions to prove that their opponents were outstepping the limits of the Constitution. Such a charge, if brought home, was annihilation to the argument of a political adversary. A cry of general indignation quickly arose against any who were even supposed to harbour disloyal feelings to the institutions of the country. Did any Northerner chance to use an expression which might seem to have such a tendency in his attacks upon some piece of pro-slavery legislation, the South and its supporters were the first to cry out against him as being untrue to the constitutional principles of the State. This sentiment of deep-rooted love to the Union and the Fed-

eral Constitution, was especially strong throughout the North, inasmuch as its people had ever been scrupulous observers of the law, who bowed at once to the electoral decisions. For many years the South had carried their own candidate in the presidential elections, and commanded the majority in Congress; thus it shaped and directed the policy of the United States. Whenever that policy displeased the Northern statesmen, they only opposed it by the admitted constitutional means; those once exhausted, the national will, as expressed by the majority, was acknowledged and submitted to by all. These considerations at once explain the indignation of the North at the illegal conduct of the South, which sought to break up the Union by force, and trampled down the Constitution merely because a President was elected who was not of their political party. For not only had the new President and his Cabinet no intention of perpetrating any illegal act, but they had not had even the opportunity of so doing. What was the course pursued by the South? It endeavoured to effect by *violence* a complete transformation in the constitutional order of things established by common consent, although the Constitution itself furnished, by its fifth Article, the legal means of proposing, under form of amendment, any fundamental change in the Federal Union which might be thought desirable. Such a mode of proceeding, at once lawful and rational, would have given the whole nation, sole legitimate judge in such matters, the opportunity of discussing the proposed change, and deciding whether or not it should be carried into effect, according to the provisions of the Constitution.

The Fifth Article runs thus:—

"The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution; or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress; . . ."

Nothing could be more illegal then than the course actually pursued by the South, nothing more legitimate than the resistance of the Federal Government. The first shot fired upon Fort Sumter was an act of unwarrantable violence against the constituted authority of the United States Government, which had in no way overstepped the bounds of its authority, and to which every official in every State had promised allegiance. From that moment the President of the United States had but one duty to perform—that of defending and maintaining by arms the legitimate authority of the Government of which he was the responsible chief. Those who contend that he should have consented to the Secession forget that he had no power whatever to give such consent. As Mr. Seward, the Secretary of State, justly laid it down, no State or States could of their own act secede; they could only do so by the consent of the people of the United States assembled in national convention according to the provisions of the Constitution. The oath of the President bound him to maintain and defend the Federal Constitution by force of arms against all enemies, from within or from without. This duty was, under the circumstances, terrible indeed. Mr. Lincoln did not fail in its performance; that is one of his chief titles to the gratitude of all who duly value the maintenance of those rights which belong to a free government. He was able to maintain them, because supported by the majority of the nation, whose love for its institutions was such that it recoiled from no sacrifice when once convinced that it was necessary to arm the President against the violators of that Federal Union and its laws which had been bequeathed to the country by the founders of American Independence.

But what, it will be asked, was the policy of Mr. Lincoln which so displeased the South? It was the policy known as the *Free-Soil* policy. The party which upheld it had for some years past been gaining strength, and in November, 1860, finally triumphed by the election of its candidate, Mr. Lincoln, to the Presidency. This *Free-Soil* policy made no attempt to interfere with slavery in those States where it already existed; but it sought to prohibit that institution from passing those limits, and spreading over the territories not yet formed into States, which are under the immediate and entire control of the Federal Government and Congress at Washington. This was a really anti-slavery, though not an abolitionist policy. Mr. Lincoln spoke of it as follows in 1858, during the elections for the nomination of a Senator to represent the State of Illinois in the Senate at Washington: "We insist on a policy that shall restrict slavery to its present limits;" and again: "We deal with slavery as with any other wrong, in so far as we can prevent its growing larger, and so deal with it that in the run of time there may be some promise of an end to it." In another speech he says that the *Republican* or *Free-Soil* party—

"Look upon slavery as being a moral, social, and political wrong; and while they contemplate it as such, they nevertheless have a due regard for its actual existence among us, and the difficulties of getting rid of it in any satisfactory way, and to all the constitutional obligations thrown about it. Yet, having a due regard for these, they desire a policy in regard to it that looks to its not creating any more danger. They insist that it should, as far as may be, be treated as a wrong, and one of the methods of treating it as a wrong is to make provision that it shall grow no larger. They desire a policy that looks to a peaceful end of slavery at some time as being wrong."

Pages might be filled with quotations from Mr. Lincoln's public speeches to the same effect. He and all his party were bent upon opposing, by every constitutional means in their power, the further extension of slavery. In a speech delivered at the Cooper Institute, New York, in February, 1860, Mr. Lincoln went into the whole question with great minuteness and ability; indeed throughout his whole life, as

well as at the time of his presidential election, he was a staunch supporter of this wise and moderate *Free-Soil* policy. There was no other essential difference between his political views and those of his predecessors in the presidential chair as regarded home politics.

The South, on the contrary, openly avowed its determination to carry slavery far and wide, to maintain and extend it in every direction. To this end all its efforts had been for many years unceasingly directed. Hardly had the Southern Secessionist Government been formed, when its Vice-President, Mr. A. H. Stephens, declared, in a memorable speech, delivered at Savannah, that *slavery* was the "corner stone" of the new Confederation, that it was "the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution."

Mr. Lincoln, when candidate for the Presidency, when elected in November, 1860, and when inaugurated on 4th March, 1861, reiterated again and again his firm resolve in no way to infringe the Constitution; nor did he or his Government ever break either the letter or the spirit of that promise. Yet scarcely was the result of the presidential election known, when South Carolina and others of the Slave States declared that they seceded from the Union, and flung off their allegiance to the Federal Government. In the meanwhile, numbers of deputations from all parts of the country waited on Mr. Lincoln, both before and after his inauguration as President. Their almost exclusive subject of discussion was the slavery question, in one form or another. Again and again Mr. Lincoln assured them that he intended to maintain the Constitution, and to confine himself strictly within its limits. He declared that he had no intention of interfering with slavery in those States where it already existed; but nothing would induce him to give up his *free-soil* policy, which desired to prohibit expressly the extension of slavery into the territories of the Union. One deputation, of which an ex-Governor of a Slave State, Mr. Morehead, was member, did its utmost to induce Mr. Lincoln to modify this part of his programme. But Mr. Lincoln replied that not under any state of the case would he consent to the extension of slavery in the Territories, to which he had been opposed all his life.

In the manifesto issued by the *Republican* or *Free-Soil* party, which nominated him as its candidate for the Presidency, it is affirmed "that the normal condition of the Territories of the United States is that of freedom, and that there is no power which has the right to make slavery a vital institution in any territory of the United States."

In December, 1861, the Federal Congress, in which for the first time the *Free-Soil* party had the majority, passed a law expressly prohibiting slavery from being introduced into the Territories. It was further abolished on the 18th March, 1862, in the District of Columbia, in which Washington stands, and which is under the sole authority of the Federal Government.

These facts clearly demonstrate that slavery was the real question at issue, and that the *Free-Soil* party, whose chosen leader was Mr. Lincoln, had always been thoroughly consistent and firm in the maintenance of its policy. They also show how wide was the difference between the principles of the Free-Soilers and those of the pro-slavery Secessionists. Indeed nothing could be more moderate or more able than the policy of the *Free-Soil* statesmen. For without infringing upon the constitutional principles of the United States system, it would have stopped the spread of slavery, thus reducing it to a mere local institution. In this manner barriers would have been erected against its further extension, and so its power diminished. By a slow and gradual process its strength would have been undermined, and its vitality weakened. Thus without necessitating political or social convulsions, slavery would have had to modify itself, to soften down its worst features, and so have taken by degrees a new and less repulsive form, more adapted to the altered circumstances of the case. From that point to its final, but not too hasty extinction, both in fact and in law, would have been a comparatively easy matter. Such a prudent course spread over a number of years would have left uninjured the planter interest, which could have adapted itself almost insensibly to the gradual change; it would also have afforded ample time for preparing the negro for freedom.

But the sad error of the Southerners in clinging to this evil institution and maintaining it at all costs; in appealing to force rather than allow it to be legally circumscribed; in turning their arms against that old Union which had accorded to them all those rights and liberties given so abundantly to the citizens of the United States, prevented the carrying out of the wise and moderate policy of the *Free-Soil* statesmen, brought fearful calamities on the entire country, and swift destruction upon that slave system to which, alas, the South clung with such culpable and fatal obstinacy.

Such, then, was the distinctive policy of that party which elected Mr. Lincoln as President. Not many days after his inauguration in March, 1861, two Southern gentlemen asked to have an interview with Mr. Seward in their capacity as Commissioners of the Secessionist States. He refused to receive them in their assumed official capacity, sending them this reply—

> "That it could not be admitted that the States referred to had, in law or fact, withdrawn from the Federal Union, or that they could do so in any other manner than with the consent and concert of the people of the United States, to be given through a national convention, to be assembled in conformity with the provisions of the Constitution of the United States."

The Secessionists made this incident the occasion of precipitating an armed rupture, by summoning Fort Sumter to surrender. This fortress, situated in Charleston harbour, belonged exclusively and absolutely to the Federal Government, the troops of which alone formed its garrison. The State of South Carolina had no right to exercise any authority whatever in or over the fort, which was the property of the national Federal Government

and was placed under its sole authority. The commander of the fortress refused to surrender it to the Carolinian general. The Secessionists at once attacked it, and, after a bombardment of thirty-three hours, it fell into their power on the 14th of April, 1861. The national flag was hauled down, and that of South Carolina hoisted in its place. This act, and the agreement entered into by the seceding States, constituted a flagrant violation of the First Article of the Constitution, which forbids any State to enter into agreement with any other State, or to levy war. These violations of the law were perpetrated, be it remembered, without the Federal Government having done or having the intention to do, any illegal act whatever.

Thus simply because the separatist minority had been beaten in the presidential election, it took up arms against the National Government, to which every official of every State, as well as all members of the Federal executive and legislature, owed allegiance. To admit that a minority has a right to appeal to arms because its particular policy is not adopted, and *that* when its Government has committed no illegal act, is to render every form of government impossible, to annihilate order and liberty alike. It is the destruction of law and the triumph of anarchy.

Yet stronger still must be the condemnation of such proceedings when placed in juxtaposition with those words, already quoted, of Mr. Stephens, the vice-president of the Secessionist Government, that slavery was the "corner stone" of the new Confederation, that it was "the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution." Well, then, might one of the greatest statesmen of the present century declare his sympathy with the Northern cause. Not that he was a republican, on the contrary, he was a great admirer of English constitutional liberties; they were his model in framing the new structure of his country's freedom. But he knew that law and order are no less necessary to a nation's welfare than independence and liberty. Therefore it was that Count Cavour wrote thus to the Italian minister at Washington, on the 22nd of May, 1861: "This reserve," that of non-intervention, "M. le Chevalier, will not prevent us from manifesting our sympathies for the triumph of the Northern States; for their cause is not only the cause of constitutional liberty, but of all humanity."

A thrill of indignation ran through the whole North at the news of the insult offered to the national flag and of the attack made upon the Federal authority. There could no longer be any doubt as to the danger which threatened the Union. Up to the attack on Fort Sumter in April, 1861, and its seizure by the separatists, the greater part of the North hoped that all would end, after much wordy war, by a peaceful arrangement of the differences between the South and the Federal Government. But the sad truth became clearer every day, and so decided the citizens of the Northern States to take up arms in good earnest in answer to the call of their Government.

The varying phases of this gigantic struggle, the immense sacrifices of men and money made by the North, its tenacity despite frequent disasters, its ever firm belief in ultimate success, prove how deep was the devotion of the Northern States to the institutions of their country, and how rooted was the conviction of their excellence and stability. At the very commencement of the war in July, 1861, the Congress of Washington passed a resolution setting forth the motives which led them to carry it on. The resolution concluded with these words:—

". . . . that this war is not waged on their part in any spirit of oppression, or for any purpose of conquest or subjugation, or purpose of overthrowing or interfering with the rights or established institutions of these States, but to defend and maintain the supremacy of the Constitution, and to preserve the Union, with all the dignity, equality, and rights of the several States unimpaired; and that as soon as these objects are accomplished the war ought to cease."

Two acts of President Lincoln during the course of this war excited especial discussion, both in Europe and in America. The one was the suspension of the privilege of Habeas Corpus, and the other the Emancipation Proclamation of 1st January, 1863. As regards the first, the Constitution had declared that "the privilege of the writ of Habeas Corpus shall not be suspended, unless when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it," but it did not determine who was to exercise the power of suspension. Mr. Lincoln and his Cabinet were of opinion that this power belonged to the President as chief of the executive, and accordingly he proceeded to exercise such power in given cases. This was done while Congress was not in session. When again assembled, that body sanctioned the action of the President, and passed a resolution to the effect "that during the present insurrection the President of the United States is authorized to suspend the Habeas Corpus, when in his judgment the public security requires it." These proceedings caused the warmest discussion. The Government and its supporters maintained the perfect legality of the President's conduct, the opposition affirmed the contrary. Each party appealed to the law, and did its utmost to show that its opponents were violating the Constitution. This was the good old ground of political disputes; and it is ever, in all free countries, whatever be their form of freedom, the only lawful battle field upon which the members of one party have a right to challenge those of the other to meet them, there to discuss the question at issue, and then decide it at the polling booth. The way, then, in which the Northern States treated this matter was the right and constitutional way. It but affords another proof of that respect for legal and constitutional methods of determining political questions which is so marked a feature in their character—a feature which ought to win for them the sympathy of the whole English race, one of whose finest characteristics is, that it combines the greatest love of freedom with the greatest respect for law.

On the 1st of January, 1863, Mr. Lincoln

proclaimed the emancipation of all slaves in those States which were in arms against the United States Government. It must be borne in mind that this act was no part of Mr. Lincoln's original programme. He adopted it as commander-in-chief of the United States forces in a time of insurrection against their authority, as a means tending to suppress that insurrection. Never let it be forgotten that Mr. Lincoln had ever been a Free-Soiler, not an abolitionist. The President's first duty, according to his oath, was to maintain and defend, by all means within his power, the Constitution of the United States, and to enforce its due observance. Such duty was perfectly compatible with the Free-Soil policy of prohibiting, by legal enactment, slavery from extending into the Territories, but to abolish slavery by his own mere motion was beyond the President's power; he could only do so as a war measure, for the re-establishment of the Federal Government's authority, as against a State or States in overt act of rebellion against that authority.

As to those Slave States which remained faithful to the Union, Mr. Lincoln desired that the Federal Government should aid them in the gradual abolition of slavery. To this end Congress had already adopted, on the 10th of March, 1862, the resolution "That the United States ought to lend their co-operation to every State which shall abolish slavery, according to it an indemnity, which the State should use according to its own discretion, to compensate for the public and private inconveniences arising from such a change of system." During the summer of this year the Congress authorized the Government to recognise officially the negro States of Hayti and Liberia. It likewise strengthened and improved the treaty with England for the suppression of the slave-trade. It also prohibited, by express enactment to that effect, slavery throughout the Territories of the United States.

Thus the policy of Mr. Lincoln, anti-slavery from the commencement of his life, by means of the Free-Soil principle, and not by the adoption of immediate abolition, took more and more this latter direction according to the necessities of the day and the growth of public opinion in favour of such a course. The President, however, took the utmost care never to infringe the principles of the Constitution.

It does not fall within the scope of the present article to deal with the military operations of the war. It may, however, be permitted to say a few words with respect to the generals who conducted it.

Assuredly it would be most unjust not to recognise the courage of the Southern soldiers and the skill of their leaders. The frequent repulses and defeats of the Federal armies, the able and prolonged defence of Richmond and Petersburg, the successful resistance offered by Charleston to formidable naval armaments, and many other similar deeds, prove the valour of the Southerners and the great capacity of their commanders. No one, either in Europe or America, can hesitate a moment to give them credit for the possession of military qualities of the highest order. So that if the Southerners are obliged to say to-day with the captive king of France, "*Tout est perdu*," they have assuredly the right to add with him, "*fors l'honneur*." Who would not receive with all respect gallant General Lee? Who does not willingly render homage to his great military talents? Nor let it be forgotten that he is by no means the only one of the Southern generals whose courage and ability have excited upon all hands real and deserved admiration.

As to the Northern generals, such as Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan, it is sufficient praise, from the military point of view, to say that they succeeded in defeating such adversaries. But this is not their greatest merit. They possess another and yet more enduring title to their country's gratitude. For, when at the head of victorious armies, numbering no less than one million of soldiers, none of them sought to make such a command the stepping-stone to his own aggrandizement. No Northern general, flushed with victory and inflated with vanity, proclaimed himself alone capable of saving the republic, and then, under pretext of so doing, sacrificed alike the lives and the rights of his fellow-countrymen to his own exaltation. None followed the evil course of those who have raised to themselves a blood-stained throne upon the wreck and ruin of their country's laws and liberties. Far other was the example that they kept in view. Ever did they remember him who set the rights and freedom of his native land above all other considerations—him whom the entire nation has with one voice proclaimed "first in peace, first in war, first in the hearts of his countrymen"—him whose name is dear, not to America alone, but to the free men of every land and of every clime—the loved and honoured name of Washington.

The like praise must be given to the statesmen of the Federal Government, for they, too, displayed that elevated patriotism which sought but to perform the duties of a faithful minister, instead of aiming at a dictator's baneful rule.

Can all the leading politicians of the South, who, both before and during the presidential election of 1860, sat in the Senate and Congress of Washington, some of whom held high positions, and even cabinet offices in the Federal Government, say that they were equally faithful to their high trust? Were there none amongst them who abetted the overthrow of that very Federal Government and Constitution which they had solemnly sworn to uphold and to defend, whose bread they were eating, and whose highest offices they filled? Were there not members of the outgoing Administration, who emptied the Federal forts in the North of arms and ammunition in order to fill those in the South, that they might thus be within reach of a hostile hand? Did they not disperse the few armed forces that the United States possessed in those days, in order that their successors might find themselves without the means of defending the authority of the United States Government, in case it were attacked? And if this be so, what other word can fitly be applied to such conduct unless it be that of *treason?*

The truth is, that the sentiment of legality

and respect for the Constitution had been decreasing in the South for some years previous to Mr. Lincoln's election. The traveller in the Southern States met with men of position and influence who avowed that they were prepared to break up the Union by force, should a Free-Soil President be elected, and *that*, even though there were nothing unconstitutional in his election or his public conduct. Thus they preferred lawless violence to constitutional opposition.

Another and yet more deplorable fact was the ever increasing attachment of the Southerners to slavery, their determination to maintain it at all costs, and to spread it everywhere. It was no longer in their eyes an evil to be tolerated, but the normal condition of the two races, a good thing in itself, despite certain drawbacks in practice. There were not wanting those who maintained it to be a divine institution, and pleaded not only for negro slavery, but for all kinds of slavery in principle, to be applied according to circumstances. Nor, if what is *called* the Bible argument be used, is there any stopping short of this hideous conclusion. Some amongst them, too, men of ability and standing, boldly demanded the re-opening of the African slave-trade, and declared themselves for free-trade in slaves as well as in all other branches of commerce. Or, as Mr. Yancey put it, with great force and clearness, "The South demands as free a trade in negroes from Africa, as the North in mules from Malta."

Sad indeed was it to hear such monstrous sentiments propounded and enforced by every argument which a misguided ingenuity could suggest. Sadder still to find them daily gaining strength in a community so many of whose members possessed noble and charming qualities. Who that has travelled in the South can ever forget the kindness and hospitality he there received? What Christmas gatherings could be fuller of everything that can render such scenes delightful, than those which were to be met with beneath the roof of the Southern planter? Such pleasant recollections mingled with the sad tales of suffering and war, were only too well calculated to fill with heaviness the heart of any one who had experienced the warm welcome of Southern hospitality.

Yet not by mere feeling, however natural and right, can be decided so great a question as that which divided for a time the United States Federal Government and the Southern Secessionists. A careful appreciation of facts, and a just application of the great principles of order and liberty, are the only right means of judging between the conflicting parties.

The more carefully the criterion of those principles is applied to the subject in question, the clearer does it become that Italy's illustrious statesman, whose words have been already quoted, was right when he condemned the slave-owners' secession movement, and declared the Northern cause to be that "not only of constitutional liberty, but of all humanity."

History does not record a more complete victory, or a more crushing defeat, than that which marked the termination of the late American war. At its close were to be seen on the one hand, victorious armies numbering a million of soldiers, perfectly equipped, ready in case of need to undertake fresh campaigns, supported by a powerful nation possessing resources which seemed almost boundless; on the other side were the broken remnants of valiant but defeated troops, encumbering a country once flourishing but now desolated, many of whose richer inhabitants were reduced to poverty, and its poorer classes to want. Hence it was that immediately after the fall of Richmond and Petersburg, Southern generals and soldiers gave up the struggle and submitted to the Federal Government. Thus abruptly finished this gigantic conflict, which but a short time before did not seem so near its close.

Scarcely had the verdict of the sword to which the Southerners had appealed been given against them, than the North gave instant proofs of a desire for peace and reconciliation. The citizens of the loyal States declared that the South should have back all its former rights, liberties, and privileges, slavery excepted, on the single condition of an honest return to the Union—that Union whose perfect reconstruction was the hearty desire of men who had ever felt for it a love and respect bordering upon idolatry.

No one longed for such a result more than the upright President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln. Already words of pardon and peace fell from his lips, already his heart thrilled with joy at the prospect of brotherly union once again restored to his native land. Bowed down through four long years beneath the double burden of his country's woes and the awful responsibilities of his own high office, the hope of happier days now dawned upon his sight and gladdened his soul, weary and worn with watching through the fearful night of his country's agony and peril. To him who had presided over the nation's destinies while the hurricane of civil war swept across the land, seemed now to be given the hallowed task of healing the Republic's wounds, of reconciling her contending sons, of releasing her once for all from slavery's hideous chain. Thus would he re-establish the pillars of the State wholly and without reserve upon justice, liberty, and law, those only sure foundations of a nation's weal, righteous and eternal even as their eternal Author. But the ways of Him, the Infinite Father, are not our ways: He had decreed that the earthly course of this noble-hearted man was run—that the good and faithful servant was now to enter into that rest which lies beyond the grave. The nation was to be yet further tried, was to pass through another crisis, but momentary indeed, yet full of deepest sorrow.

No words can depict the anguish and horror of the American people when they learned that their true-hearted President had been murdered. If anything can have lessened their bitter grief it was the reprobation of that foul crime by every civilized nation, and the heartfelt expression of sympathy offered by every friend of justice and humanity. In a moment the shout of victory was hushed throughout the

land. Its busy millions ceased from their accustomed labours. For a time no sound was heard save the long deep wail of a nation's grief. Every heart was heavy, every home was desolate. Hundreds of thousands, without distinction of creed or party, class or colour, mingled in that funeral procession of a thousand miles which stretched from Washington to Springfield, Illinois, where repose the mortal remains of Abraham Lincoln. Others have possessed more brilliant genius, others have shown as unyielding tenacity; but none have ever united clearness of intellect and firmness of purpose to a gentler heart or a purer patriotism. Henceforth there are in America two spots sacred to every friend of constitutional law and to every lover of human freedom—Mount Vernon, where lies buried "the father of his country," and Oak Ridge Cemetery, where rests from his labours her Martyr-President.

There were those who, untaught by past blunders, did not hesitate to predict a revolution, or at least a lengthened period of confusion and disorder. Some seemed to fancy that Northern soldiers, if not armies, maddened with rage, would rush South and commence a general massacre. Others declared nothing could save the nation but one of the generals seizing at once the reins of power.

The Americans thought of nothing and followed nothing but the Constitution. According to its provisions, Mr. Johnson, the Vice-President, took the prescribed oath a few hours after Mr. Lincoln's death, and so became President. Mr. Hunter, one of the under-secretaries of the State Department, filled *ad interim* Mr. Seward's post, who had been nearly assassinated while lying ill in bed. Thus everything followed the regular legal course without a moment's interruption or danger. There was but given to the world another proof of that deep-seated love of law, which is so potent an element in the system of the United States and in the character of its people. This fact is still further brought out by two incidents which occurred about this time and which are worthy of mention.

It appears that after Mr. Lincoln's murder some foreign paper had alluded to or suggested the idea of General Grant's instantly putting himself at the head of the Government. This was told to the general not very long after, upon which he said, quietly, that such a thought had never crossed his brain, and even if it had he could not have put it in execution; for there was not in his army a single soldier who would have abetted him in such an enterprise. Such words in the mouth of the conqueror of Richmond and Vicksburg show what was the character of the man himself and of his army.

Very shortly before President Lincoln's death an armistice was agreed upon between General Sherman and one of the Southern generals; the President, however, set it aside, because in his judgment Sherman had overstepped his powers in certain particulars. The ready and entire submission with which the general bowed to the President's decision affords a noteworthy proof of the power which constituted authorities possess in the United States.

Many and bitter were the attacks which had been made on Abraham Lincoln. The like were now directed against his successor. Neither his origin nor his character was spared; his future policy was denounced beforehand as cruel and sanguinary. Andrew Johnson has given them the most complete of all replies — he has lived them down. He is now known to the world as one of the ablest men of the day. Born of poor parents in North Carolina, he migrated while still a youth to Tennessee, where he worked as a journeyman tailor. His education had been much neglected, and it was only about the age of twenty that he learned to read and write, by the assistance of his wife. But from that day he set to work at his own instruction with such ardour and perseverance that he soon made up for lost time. He gained quickly the confidence of his fellow-citizens, and after occupying various less important posts he was elected senator for the State of Tennessee. Favourable to slavery, he was consequently unfavourable to the Free-Soil policy of which Mr. Lincoln was already a well-known supporter. But he opposed from the very commencement the secessionist movement. Alone amongst the Southern senators, he resisted it with the whole weight of his influence and eloquence. He denounced the course taken by the Secessionists, both in the Senate at Washington and elsewhere, as utterly illegal, and as a flagrant breach of the Constitution. He predicted that it would bring fearful calamities upon the whole country, especially upon the South. He went down in person to his own State of Tennessee, and did his utmost to turn her from the evil path of secession. This courageous and patriotic conduct nearly cost him his life, thanks to the outrageous violence of his separatist opponents. He was obliged at last to fly from Tennessee, and returned to Washington, where he remained throughout the war. Devoted to the maintenance of the Union, Mr. Senator Johnson, as he then was, supported the Washington Government in its determination to maintain with a strong hand the just authority and rights of the Federal Government. His views of public policy assimilated themselves more and more, as time went on, to those of Mr. President Lincoln, and finally came into perfect agreement with them. When the latter was elected President a second time, Mr. Johnson was elected with him as Vice-President. It was a most wise choice, for he had shown a rare mixture of courage and ability. He had remained faithful to the Union, and being, as he was, a Southern senator, the Northerners by such a selection clearly showed that it was not against the South *as such*, that they were fighting, but against the violators of the law and the Constitution. Since his accession to the presidency he has discharged the duties of his high office and directed the policy of the country with a firmness, moderation, and tact, which prove him to be a man of no ordinary capacity. The work which Mr. Johnson and his Government have had to do has been of the most difficult and delicate kind.

Dangers of the most opposite character beset the object to which all their efforts have been directed—that of reconstructing the Union. If too great leniency were shown, there was danger of losing in point of fact one of the best fruits of the crisis through which the nation had passed. For to abolish slavery and yet leave the future of the former slaves *entirely* in the hands of their old masters, would have been to abolish it only in name: guarantees were necessary that this should be a bonâ fide abolition, carried into practical effect. It was also just to ask of the South tangible proofs, in one form or another, of its sincerity and loyalty in returning to the Union. On the other hand it was most desirable, both as a matter of policy and of principle, not to be too severe or even too exacting. Such a course would have been wrong, and would besides have hindered the work of reconstruction which the United States Government and people earnestly wished to further; it would, moreover, have irritated the South and indisposed it towards that party among its own citizens which desired to return to their old allegiance in all good faith. Nor let it be forgotten that such a party not only existed in the South, but was both numerous and influential. A few facts will show that the Washington Government has, at least to a very great extent, avoided both these opposite dangers; that it has followed a course which, speaking generally, may be pronounced worthy of an enlightened and free government, presiding, in times of no little difficulty, over the destinies of a great and a Christian people.

Andrew Johnson succeeded to the presidency on the 15th of April, 1865 (the very day of Mr. Lincoln's death), but the session of Congress did not begin until December. The President and his Cabinet had therefore to direct, during the interval, the general policy and affairs of the country. The Government, while keeping closely within the limits of the Constitution, and carefully abstaining from all entrenchment upon the prerogatives or action of the Federal Congress, used every lawful means to further the work of reconstruction.

The President among other measures, decreed a general amnesty, one of whose clauses seemed hard—that clause which excluded from the benefits of this measure all persons who possessed a capital amounting to 20,000 dollars or more. Its real object was to oblige all such persons to ask a special pardon, which was at once given on their promise of renewed allegiance to the Union, and adherence to the late President's proclamation for the abolition of slavery. The demands for these pardons were so numerous that it cost an immense amount of time and labour to furnish them to the multitude of applicants who sought them. This able stroke of policy thus succeeded admirably. It rehabilitated the Southerners of influence and position, whilst it obliged them personally to acknowledge the wrong they had done and ask for pardon. It further obtained from them an additional guarantee against the return of slavery, whilst awaiting its complete abolition, by passing to that effect an Amendment to the Constitution, according to the provisions of the Fifth Article.

The Government likewise established throughout the South a vast number of "Freedmen's Bureaux," under the direction of that good and brave man, General Howard, who, it has been said, won for himself during the war the title of the "Hedley Vicars of the Federal army." The mission of these bureaux is to afford aid, work, and protection to the recently enfranchised negroes. Throughout the North, private societies have been formed with the same object, only yet further extended to all in need of such assistance, without distinction of race or colour.

The President hastened to name provisional governors in the States recently in revolt. Their duty was to reassure the inhabitants, and to restore the machinery of government. They called together State conventions, for the double purpose of annulling the Secession ordinances and sanctioning the abolition of slavery. These were the only two acts which were demanded as a *sine quâ non* of their full re-admission into the Union, with all their former rights, privileges, and liberties. As to the suffrage, the President decided nothing—believing the matter to lie beyond his power. It was left, like that of the time and manner of the final re-admission of the Southern representatives into the Federal Congress, to be settled by the nation through the action of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States. This clement policy of the Washington Government in the hour of victory was further manifested by the fact that no life was forfeited, excepting that of those who were proved to be accomplices in Mr. Lincoln's murder, and that of a certain Wirz convicted of heinous cruelty towards Northern prisoners incarcerated at Andersonville. Such lenient conduct was but right, yet rarely, if ever, has it marked the close of those civil strifes which have desolated in turn every country of the Old World. The reception of a numerous and important Southern deputation by Mr. Johnson at the White House, brought out in all their force these noble sentiments of mercy and reconciliation. The deputation waited on him to make known their views and hopes upon the vital question of reconstruction. Nothing could be more kindly, more dignified, or more truly Christian, than the words and bearing of the President of the United States upon that occasion. In a speech couched in noble and appropriate language, he expressed the pleasure it gave him to hear the deputation acknowledge the errors of the past. He assured those present of his sincere desire to give back to the South all its rights. He would adhere strictly to the Constitution, maintain it in all its integrity, and make it the means of restoring the Southern States to their former position. The noble feelings expressed by the President, his reiterated assurances of good will, his treatment of the Southerners as brothers—as sons of a common country—who had erred indeed, but who were and ever had been brothers, touched all present, and produced a

deep impression. More than once the chief magistrate was interrupted by the approbation and the emotion of his audience. The members of the deputation expressed their firm resolve to do all in their power towards the reconstruction of the Union. At length they retired, full of hope and confidence, renewing again their promise to join heartily in the work of restoring harmony and peace throughout the length and breadth of their common country.

How great is the contrast offered by this brotherly reconciliation between the chief of a free nation and some of its sons for a time led astray, and those scenes of bloody repression which have marked the triumph of many a European despot over his own subjects, whom long years of oppression and misrule had goaded into rebellion!

The policy of Mr. Johnson may be summed up in these words: "The Constitution in all its integrity!" He had been faithful to it in the hour of danger: he made it the supreme rule of his conduct in the hour of victory. But he determined to apply it, even in the case of those who had taken up arms against it, with all the leniency consistent with its due maintenance. Such conduct was worthy of the constitutional chief of a free government, when dealing with those who had ever been considered as erring brothers, and who were now completely at its mercy.

The last and highest expression of the President's policy is to be found in the message which he addressed to the United States Senate and House of Representatives, on the 4th December, 1865. After thanking God, in the name of the people, for the preservation of the State, the message sets forth the object of the Union, and what it really was in the intention of its authors: "The Union of the United States was intended by its authors to last as long as the States themselves shall last. *The Union shall be perpetual!* are the words of the Confederation. '*To form a more perfect Union*' by an ordinance of people of the United States, is the declared purpose of the Constitution." The prolonged labours and the earnest discussions by which this great work was accomplished are recalled, as is also the fact that all opinions and feelings were ultimately united in its support. It is shown that the Constitution possesses two most important powers: that of maintaining its authority and that of reforming itself when such reform is deemed necessary. Upon these points the message says:—

"The Constitution to which life was thus imparted contains within itself ample resources for its own preservation. It has power to enforce the laws, punish treason, and insure domestic tranquillity. In case of the usurpation of the government of a State by one man or an oligarchy, it becomes a duty of the United States to make good the guarantee to that State of a Republican form of government, and so to maintain the homogeneousness of all. Does the lapse of time reveal defects? A simple mode of amendment is provided in the Constitution itself, so that its conditions can always be made to conform to the requirements of advancing civilization. No room is allowed even for the thought of a possibility of its coming to an end. And these powers of self-preservation have always been asserted in their complete integrity by every patriotic chief magistrate—by Jefferson and Jackson, not less than by Washington and Madison. The parting advice of the father of his country, while yet President, to the people of the United States, was, that 'the free Constitution, which was the work of their hands, might be sacredly maintained;' and the inaugural words of President Jefferson held up 'the preservation of the General Government, in its constitutional vigour, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad.' The Constitution is the work of 'the people of the United States,' and it should be as indestructible as the people."

The message fully admits that the various State Governments have their rights, as well as the Federal Government, but declares that all questions at issue can only be settled lawfully by the employment of those means which the Constitution affords, and never by force. "The absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority was," says the message, "at the beginning of the present century enforced by Jefferson as the vital principle of republics." Indeed, it must ever be, in one form or another, the vital principle of every species of free government, for without it there is no other settlement but that of brute force.

The supremacy of the Constitution is emphatically set forth in these words, taken from the Constitution itself:—

"The Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

The part of the message which touches on the reorganization of the Southern States shows the extreme care of the Washington Government to avoid alike over-indulgence and undue rigour, as well as its constant adherence to the law and to the Constitution as its supreme guide. The following considerations worthy of remark are made touching the question of secession and the position in which those States were placed who took part in it:—

"The true theory is, that all pretended acts of secession were, from the beginning, null and void. The States cannot commit treason, nor screen the individual citizens who may have committed treason, any more than they can make valid treaties or engage in lawful commerce with any foreign Power. The States attempting to secede placed themselves in a condition where their vitality was impaired, but not extinguished—their functions suspended, but not destroyed.

"But if any State neglects or refuses to perform its offices, there is the more need that the General Government should maintain all its authority, and, as soon as practicable, resume the exercise of all its functions. On this principle I have acted, and have gradually and quietly, and by almost imperceptible steps, sought to restore the rightful energy of the General Government and of the States. To that end provisional governors have been appointed for the States, conventions called," &c.

The final accomplishment of the work of reconstruction, the time and mode of re-admitting

the Southern representatives into the Federal Congress, and the delicate question of the suffrage, are left undecided by the President. He desires to accomplish them in accordance with the united action of Congress, and by its aid.

With regard to the freedmen, the following admirable language is held:—

"But while I have no doubt that now, after the close of the war, it is not competent for the General Government to extend the elective franchise in the several States, it is equally clear that good faith requires the security of the freedmen in their liberty and their property, their right to labour, and their right to claim the just return of their labour. I cannot too strongly urge a dispassionate treatment of this subject, which should be carefully kept aloof from all party strife. We must equally avoid hasty assumptions of any natural impossibility for the two races to live side by side in a state of mutual benefit and good will. The experiment involves us in no inconsistency; let us, then, go and make that experiment in good faith, and not be too easily disheartened. The country is in need of labour, and the freedmen are in need of employment, culture, and protection. While their right of voluntary migration and expatriation is not to be questioned, I would not advise their forced removal and colonization. Let us rather encourage them to honourable and useful industry, where it may be beneficial to themselves and to the country; and instead of hasty anticipations of the certainty of failure, let there be nothing wanting to the fair trial of the experiment."

As to the Constitutional Amendment for the abolition of slavery, since carried and become law, according to the provisions of the 5th Article, the President earnestly advises its adoption. It is interesting to observe how he speaks of slavery as "essentially a monopoly of labour," as "the element which has so long perplexed and divided the country," and adds, further, "that the adoption of the Amendment reunites us beyond all power of disruption." Thus he admits that slavery was the real cause of the rupture which had taken place, and which it was now the common desire of all to heal for ever.

Such views of President Johnson fully agree with those set forth by Mr. A. H. Stephens of Georgia, the ex-Vice-President of the ex-separatist Government, who, but a few weeks after its formation, said at a great meeting in Savannah:—

"The new Constitution" of the Secessionist Confederation "has set at rest for ever all agitating questions relating to our peculiar institution—African slavery as it exists among us—the proper state of the negro in our form of civilization. This was the immediate cause of the late rupture, and present revolution. Jefferson in his forecast had anticipated this as the rock upon which the old Union would split. He was right."

If there are still any persons prepared to assert that slavery had little or nothing to do with the Secessionist movement and war, let them meditate upon this united testimony of President Johnson and of Mr. A. H. Stephens.

The message, pregnant as it is with the wisest, the most moderate, and the most enlightened policy, concludes by an eloquent panegyric of the United States and its institutions. It is worth reading for its own sake, although in some respects it may be considered too highly coloured; but it is especially desirable to do so in order to compare it with another panegyric on the same subject, uttered by a very different man, in very different circumstances. That of the President's message runs thus:—

"Here is the great land of free labour, where industry is blessed with unexampled rewards, and the bread of the working man is sweetened by the consciousness that the cause of the country 'is his own cause, his own safety, his own dignity.' Here every one enjoys the free use of his faculties and the choice of activity as a natural right. Here, under the combined influence of a fruitful soil, genial climes, and happy institutions, population has increased fifteenfold within a century. Here, through the easy development of boundless resources, wealth has increased with twofold greater rapidity than numbers, so that we have become secure against the financial vicissitudes of other countries, and, alike in business and in opinion, are self-centred and truly independent. Here more and more care is given to provide education for every one born on our soil. Here religion, released from political connexion with the civil government, refuses to subserve the craft of statesmen, and becomes, in its independence, the spiritual life of the people. Here toleration is extended to every opinion, in the quiet certainty that truth needs only a fair field to secure the victory. Here the human mind goes forth unshackled in the pursuit of science, to collect stores of knowledge, and acquire an ever-increasing mastery over the forces of nature. Here the national domain is offered and held in millions of separate freeholds, so that our fellow-citizens, beyond the occupants of any other part of the earth, constitute in reality a people. Here exists the democratic form of government; and that form of government, by the confession of European statesmen, 'gives a power of which no other form is capable, because it incorporates every man with the State, and arouses everything that belongs to the soul.'

"Where, in past history, does a parallel exist to the public happiness which is within the reach of the people of the United States? Where, in any part of the globe, can institutions be found so suited to their habits or so entitled to their love as their own free Constitution? Every one of them, then, in whatever part of the land he has his home, must wish its perpetuity. Who of them will not now acknowledge, in the words of Washington, that 'every step by which the people of the United States have advanced to the character of an independent nation, seems to have been distinguished by some token of Providential agency?' Who will not join with me in the prayer that the invisible hand which has led us through the clouds that gloomed around our path, will so guide us onward to a perfect restoration of fraternal affection, that we of this day may be able to transmit our great inheritance of State Governments in all their rights, of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigour, to our posterity, and they to theirs, through countless generations? ANDREW JOHNSON.

"Washington, Dec. 4, 1865."

Let it be remarked in passing, that these last words prove that, far from wishing to diminish the rights of the governments of the various States on account of the late rebellion, or on account of the abuse of the doctrine of States Rights, the President would fully maintain

them, just as he would preserve in all their vigour the rights of the Federal Government. Or, as he puts it in another place, "So long as the Constitution of the United States endures, the States will endure; the destruction of the one is the destruction of the other; the preservation of the one is the preservation of the other."

The second panegyric which has been alluded to, forms part of a speech delivered on the 14th November, 1860, before the legislature of the State of Georgia, with a view to dissuade it from joining the Secession movement. The man who delivered it was no other than Mr. A. H. Stephens, who, in November, 1860, opposed secession, and then in the following February became Vice-President of the Secessionist Confederation. His words are well worth a careful perusal:—

"I look upon this country, with our institutions, as the Eden of the world—the Paradise of the universe. It may be, that out of it we may become greater and more prosperous, but I am candid and sincere in telling you that I fear, if we rashly evince passion, and without sufficient cause shall take that step [of secession], that instead of becoming greater, or more peaceful, prosperous, and happy—instead of becoming gods, we will become demons, and at no distant day commence cutting each others' throats.

"The first question that presents itself is, Shall the people of the South secede from the Union in consequence of the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency of the United States? My countrymen, I tell you candidly, frankly, and earnestly, that I do not think that they ought. In my judgment, the election of no man constitutionally chosen to that high office is sufficient cause for any State to separate from the Union. It ought to stand by, and still aid in maintaining the Constitution of the country. To make a point of resistance to the Government, to withdraw from it because a man has been constitutionally elected, puts us in the wrong. . . . . We went into the election with this people. The result was different from what we wished; but the election has been constitutionally held. Were we to make a point of resistance to the Government, and go out of the Union on this account, the record would be made up hereafter against us."

In another place Mr. Stephens says:—

"This step, once taken, could never be recalled; and all the baleful and withering consequences that must follow [as they would see], will rest on the Convention for all coming time . . . . . What right has the North assailed? What interest of the South has been invaded? What justice has been denied? And what claim, founded in justice and right, has been withheld? Can either of you to-day name one governmental act of wrong, deliberately and purposely done, by the Government of Washington, of which the South has a right to complain? I challenge the answer."

He then enters into many details to show that no wrong has been done, and that the South has had its full share, and even more, of all the honours, offices, rights and liberties of their common country and Government. After which he concludes by asking why this scission:—

"Is it for the overthrow of the American Government, established by our common ancestry, cemented and built up by their sweat and blood, and founded on the broad principles of right, justice, and humanity? and, as such—I must declare here, as I have often done before, and which has been repeated by the greatest and wisest of statesmen and patriots, that it is the best and freest of governments—the most equal in its rights, the most just in its decisions, the most lenient in its measures, and the most inspiring in its principles to elevate the race of men, that the sun of heaven ever shone upon. Now, for you to attempt to overthrow such a Government as this, under which we have lived for more than three quarters of a century—in which we have gained our wealth, our standing as a nation, our domestic safety while the elements of peril are around us, with peace and tranquillity, accompanied by unbounded prosperity, and rights unassailed—is the height of madness, folly, and wickedness, to which I can neither lend my sanction nor my vote."

Such words in the mouth of such a man need no commentary.

Do not, then, both facts and arguments prove that love of law and devotion to the Constitution are indelible features of the American character; and that for them the majority of the nation is prepared to make the very greatest sacrifices? Is it not to-day clear what were the real motives which roused the Government and people of the United States to vindicate the outraged authority of the Federal rule, and maintain, at all costs, its supreme and lawful rights?

Can an impartial mind any longer deny that the Secessionists on the contrary trampled on the Constitution and the law, and appealed to that sword which decided against them, although the Federal Government had not overstepped, even by a hair's breadth, its constitutional limits? And yet the cause of such conduct was even worse than the conduct itself; for it arose from the opposition of the South to the wise and moderate policy of the Free-Soil statesmen who, in 1861, came into the legal possession of constitutional power. The Southerners, rather than allow that policy to be adopted, broke through the law, took up arms, plunged the country into civil war, and sought by such lawless means to found a new confederation, based upon "the corner stone of slavery."

The war once closed, constitutional means and principles have alone guided the Federal Government in the delicate work of reconstruction. And even these have been applied with all the leniency compatible with the Federal Union's laws and just authority.

But there is another aspect of this great question that must not be passed over. It is a matter of the highest import that the great principles of law and order should have been thus vindicated by a people which delights to call itself the freest upon earth, and which is certainly amongst the freest. It has thus by deeds, not words alone, declared that freedom cannot exist without order, that respect for the law is absolutely necessary to the possession of liberty. It is a lesson that can never be forgot, a precedent to be referred to through all future ages. The ultimate result of this tremendous conflict proves also that a free government is perfectly compatible with a strong government; and that such a government can enforce its constitutional

laws without sacrificing its liberties, even though it should deem it necessary to suspend some of them for a time in a moment of danger. It demonstrates admirably that order must not be sacrificed to liberty, nor liberty to order. The United States of America have thus set their seal to the all-important truth, that these two great principles are essentially necessary to each other, that both are of vital importance to the existence of a free and well governed people.

Now there were none who sympathized more heartily with the Northern States and the Federal Government throughout the late war than the working classes of England, especially the artisans of her great cities. To their lasting honour it must be said that they judged well and truly the American question; they ever supported staunchly and manfully that cause which no less an authority than the great Cavour had declared to be "not only that of constitutional liberty, but of all humanity."

Let them, then, never forget the great lesson which the free Government and people of the United States have inculcated upon the world. Let them remember, that just as order without freedom is little else than tyranny, so freedom without order is little better than anarchy. Let them bear in mind that liberty and law must ever go hand in hand, that the co-operation of the two is absolutely needful to the very existence of a free and well governed nation. Thus continuing to think and act, the operative classes will add daily to the proofs already existing, that to admit them in a just proportion to a direct participation in the choice of England's representatives, is but to widen and strengthen the basis upon which repose those ancient laws and liberties which we English love so proudly and so well.

But one word more. There are those who dread the growing power of the United States, and that chiefly on account of its republican form of government. Yet, while believing that, in the Old World at any rate, constitutional monarchy is the best form of freedom, it is only just to add that the republican is but another form of that same freedom, and not a hostile system. What, after all, lies at the basis of America's republican institutions, if not our own English laws and liberties? Whence comes the system of her jurisprudence, whence her juries? From whence do her legal authorities draw their precedents? Her free press, her public meetings, the two Houses which in her every State form the legislature, are they not outgrowths of England's system? The principle of self-government, and that local application of it in every portion of American soil, is it not of English origin?

Wherever America's dominion extends, it ever carries with it the germ of these rich blessings, spreads abroad England's faith and mother tongue, thus advancing her free and Christian civilization.

Is it, indeed, so terrible a thing to see them spreading throughout the New World?

Is it worthy of English hearts and intellects to tremble at such a prospect?

Would they not do better to rejoice and take courage? Should they not rather bid God speed to the younger branch of our great English family?

Such, assuredly, is the feeling of England's toiling millions; and they are right. There is no good reason for a wretched display of petty jealousy between the mother country and her stalwart son. Their prosperity and friendship are mighty elements of the world's order, freedom, and progress. Therefore England's people do well to say to their kinsmen of America—"May brotherly union, with all its attendant blessings, be completely restored throughout the length and breadth of your vast dominion. So may all your federated States rally anew around your star-decked flag, planted by the hand of immortal Washington and saved by that of your loved patriot and martyr, Abraham Lincoln. So may each one of your citizens, whether his State lie on the Atlantic or the Pacific shore, whether watered by the Northern lakes or by the Southern gulf, repeat from his heart those noble words of Daniel Webster, 'I know no North, I know no South, I know only my country.' So may your future be yet greater and more prosperous than your past, and that, not by means of crafty policy, not by the brutal force of arms, nor yet because your material wealth increases: but because now your institutions rest, without reserve, upon the sure foundations of justice, liberty, and right; because now you recognise those sacred principles as the common heritage of all, without distinction of class, or creed, or colour; because now the fair page of your Constitution is no longer soiled by the foul stain of Slavery!"

J. W. P.

Art. VI.—Paul Louis Courier.

Œuvres Complètes de P. L. Courier, précédée d'un Essai sur la Vie et les Ecrits de l'Auteur. Par Armand Carrel. Paris: Didot Frères. 1861.

"Détournez *ce calice.* Remove this cup from me. The hemlock is bitter, and the world is converted well enough by itself, without my interfering with it, poor creature that I am."

These are the words, almost the last words, of Paul Louis Courier. They are written in answer to the exhortation of an enthusiastic friend, who bade him go forth and preach to the world, and pay the price of doing so, as St. Paul had paid it, as Socrates had paid it, as every great teacher in every age of history has paid it, by bitter persecution, by rousing a hatred against himself that might perhaps crush him, but could not help aiding him by its opposition. This style is more serious than Courier usually employs. A perfect master of irony, he commonly prefers the use of the weapon with which he most excelled; and to us, who know how soon his own death was to follow—how soon he was to drink of the cup which he would fain have put from him, such words may well seem to have a sense almost prophetic, saddened and restrained by the fore-

sight, if such were possible, of an end which his admirers have the right to consider as a martyrdom.

When Courier spoke of persecution, and expressed his hope of avoiding it, he spoke of what he had himself known, and of what he had not always aimed at avoiding. We may be in doubt, perhaps, what gospel his friend would have had him preach, and in what way he could hope that it would benefit his fellow-creatures; we may be sure, at least, that he was ever ready to risk his own personal safety in the cause of the oppressed and helpless, and that a great part of his later life was devoted to the utterance of that from which he could gain nothing whatever, but which kept him constantly embroiled with the French Government, and rendered him the object of a very ignoble but a very dangerous persecution. Courier was not cast in the saintly type—very far from it—nor in the heroic type, though he had many of the qualities of a hero. The pleasures of his later days were few and simple, chiefly literary and domestic; and he would have been satisfied if he had been left quietly to enjoy life in his own way, and if he had seen those around him sharing the same privilege. It was because he did not see this—it was because he saw them, on the contrary, harassed by a thousand petty annoyances, and prohibited from a thousand innocent enjoyments, that he took up arms in their behalf rather than in his own, and used with such terrible effect a weapon which no other could wield as he could—a literary style in which he was absolutely without a rival. It was in this that Courier was a hero—in that he was able to feel as strong an indignation at the wrongs of others as at his own; and in that he could not bear to allow any wrong to pass unnoticed which he had it in his power to expose, and so to remedy. And in doing this he did not count the cost; he accepted the sacrifice it involved, so only that he could accomplish the work he aimed at. Whether or not we allow him the title of a hero, we must allow that he possessed that without which neither saintliness nor heroism can be of any great importance; and that the first requisite for all nobility of character consists in the power of identifying, as he did, the interests of others with one's own.

Courier was born at Paris in 1773. His education was not at first very systematic; but he acquired, in the course of it, a taste, which never left him, for the best models of ancient literature, and the best expressions of ancient thought and feeling. These were his first choice, and he never abandoned them. When he came afterwards to the study of the exact sciences, he came to it with a mind already occupied with other matters, and he could never bring himself to study them with any ardour. He would have exchanged, he said, all the truths of Euclid for one page of Isocrates. At the commencement of the great Revolution, Courier was still a boy; and the events and need of the Revolution determined his first choice of a career. In 1792 he went to the military school at Châlons; and he was sent, in the year following, to the frontiers, as an officer of artillery. His life as a soldier lasted for fifteen years; but from first to last he had no love for what he termed his "vile profession," and he was engaged throughout in studies of a kind more congenial to him than the ordinary soldier's duties. He found it useful afterwards to be able to claim a place as one of the early heroes of the Revolution, as one of the defenders of his country's frontiers during the season of the great invasions. Such antecedents, after the return of the Bourbons, however little likely to recommend him to the Government, at least secured him a favourable hearing from the people, to whom his pamphlets were addressed. But his early life and career, if they had been examined strictly, would scarcely have justified his assumption.

It was, as we have said, in 1793 that Courier began his career as a soldier. It was an era, then, of no common enthusiasm. The Revolution was still in the full fervour of its youth, and elated with its early triumphs; and its soldiers, in addition to the ordinary motives of a military career, felt themselves fighting in the vanguard of human progress—the champions not of France only, but of humanity. But whatever sentiment of the moment may have led Courier to the choice of his profession, it was not with much ardour that he now followed it. He was no coward; he was ready enough to risk his life in the excitement of battle. But his letters show him to us little interested in the course of events, little anxious for the kind of distinction that he had it in his power to achieve. He was a soldier by profession and by necessity, but by taste a scholar and an antiquarian. For two years he continued to discharge such duties as were assigned to him, careless equally about advancement and glory. In the third year he left the army, and came home, without leave, as a deserter. The siege of Mayence was in progress, the cold was excessive, the sufferings of the army intolerable; and further, Courier had just received news of his father's death. He accordingly quitted his post, having, as he tells us, just escaped being quite frozen to death, and returned home to his family. He was, of course, reclaimed as a deserter; and though his friends made interest for him sufficient to shelter him from the extreme punishment to which he was liable, yet for three years he was in disgrace, occupied with routine duties in the interior, and was not allowed to share the triumphs of the French arms in Italy.

But his time, during this forced retirement, was passed in a way he liked far better than he liked the life of a soldier. He was a scholar, and he had now abundant leisure for reading; and he was young and fond of pleasure, and for that too he found abundant opportunity. The Convention was now ended, and with it the seriousness and earnestness of the early Revolution. A gayer period had come in with the Directory; and Courier, young and full of life and spirits, surrendered himself easily to the *abandon* of the moment, and found himself the universal favourite of a society whose one aim it had become to give and to receive pleasure. The power of sharing and intensely appreciating such a mode of life was an essential

part of Courier's nature. To the last it had never left him, though the objects in which he sought for pleasure continually varied. His noblest and most serious pursuits were engaged in rather as the gratification of a whim than as the discharge of a grave duty. He was distinguished from other men, not by more energy of will, but by greater powers of performance.

In 1798 Courier was again employed in active service; and for ten more years his duties, distasteful as they were to him, were continued. He was fearless of personal danger, but the monotony of a soldier's life was annoying to him; and further, he was too indifferent to the course of events to care very much which side conquered, so unable was he to identify himself with one to the exclusion of all sympathy with the opposite; and in this temper he now went to Italy, rather to deplore the ravages of his country's arms, than with any wish to contribute to his country's triumphs. A good soldier, more even than a good theologian, should be very narrow in his views of man and of society, and should be able to believe with all his soul that his enemies are wholly in the wrong and that the cause he is contending for is the only just one. For the sword is a very tangible reality, and the consequences of its use seem to need some justification. The invectives of a theologian are perhaps felt, even by himself, to be less dangerous to those at whom they are directed. It may be replied, perhaps, that whether an enemy is sent down to Hades by temporal or spiritual weapons—by the tangible reality of a sword, or by the Churchman's airy anathema—it matters little, so only that the same result is arrived at. But it may be replied that the objector has assumed that the same result is arrived at, and that on that point the Churchman himself may reasonably entertain a doubt.

In 1808 Courier resigned his commission and left the army; but his career as a soldier was not yet quite ended. The year that followed his resignation was one for France of vast military effort. The impulse of war spread itself through all the country. The preparations made were immense, and Bonaparte, lately triumphant in Spain, was himself to command the armies destined for the conquest of Vienna. Courier was impelled by the prevailing enthusiasm. The thought of serving under Bonaparte inflamed his imagination, and excited, even in him, the thirst for military glory. But his late resignation was a matter which could not be overlooked, and he was obliged to join the army without a commission and with no definite duties assigned to him. His ardour to be present at the scene of action was not very long-lived; his "quarter of an hour of folly" was soon ended. He saw war now as he had never before seen it, on a scale which reduced the actions of individuals to insignificance, and accompanied by a slaughter greater than is usual even in the vastest military operations. The horrors of such a war were intolerable to him. The two fearful days on the island of Lobau, and the movements of troops which preceded Wagram, were the last scenes of the kind at which he was present. He left the army for ever, and retired once more to literature and to his favourite Italy. His illusions were ended, and his life henceforth is purely that of a civilian.

During the remaining years of the Empire, Courier lived in retirement, travelled a good deal, and attracted occasional notice by a very clever letter or pamphlet. He married about the close of 1814, and fixed his abode in France, in the neighbourhood of Tours, where he followed a country life, careless of the political changes which were now in such constant progress. His chief fame is based upon what he wrote after the second restoration of the Bourbons. It is time, therefore, to say something of the manner and purpose of his writings; of the principles he wished to put forward, and of the occasions which incited him to publish them.

Courier does not seem to have had any fixed opinions in politics. On such matters he was always, as he tells us himself, on the side of the last speaker. He loved personal liberty for himself and for others, and was indignant with his whole soul against political persecution, as he was against religious persecution. But as to the kind of rule under which liberty was enjoyed—to that he was profoundly indifferent. If the advantages of a republic were pointed out to him, and it was proved that liberty could be secured under a republic, he felt himself, for the moment, republican. The next moment he would range himself, just as readily, on the side of monarchy, provided always that liberty were not to be endangered by it; and would hold to his new opinions with as little tenacity as to his old ones. He was quite willing to leave to fools the contest about forms of government; to him "that which was best administered was best," and that was best administered which secured its subjects or citizens the largest measure possible of freedom in thought, in expression, and in action. His religious creed it is less easy to determine. The hatred and contempt he expressed for Catholic priests and for Catholicism depended largely no doubt on the peculiar state of France at the time he wrote. Catholicism was dominant under the Bourbons. It had become a persecuting faith, and was taking revenge, as well as it could, for the Revolution which had flung it down. And it was administered by men of a type with which Courier had little sympathy. Young *curés* from the seminary, burning to advance a cause which was their own, fanatical in their religious zeal and their strictness about the morality of others, careless enough about their own, for they were men and celibates, gaining an influence by the confessional which was always fatal to family independence, and was frequently abused for purposes far worse than a merely spiritual despotism—such were the priests whom Courier saw about him in the provinces, such was the *cagoterie* which his pamphlets so unsparingly exposed. He speaks with affection of a race of priests which he had known and which was fast dying out; men beloved by their people, sharing their simple country life, joining harmlessly in their country sports, and making it the object of their

lives to do good to others. He did not share their faith; but he could appreciate and do justice to their goodness.

Courier has left on record a statement of his faith, if we may call it so; it is a statement at least of his principles. He calls it so himself. He had applied to be admitted as a member of the *Académie des Inscriptions*, of which his brother-in-law, M. Clavier, had been a member for many years. His claims for such a distinction were very high. He was well known as a good Greek scholar; he had published several translations from the Greek, and he had passed many years of his life in the particular studies which it was the object of the Academy to promote. These claims, however, were unanimously rejected, and certain gentlemen were elected as members, of whom it was said, "They do not indeed know any Greek, but their principles are known to us." This Courier professes to have felt as a blow aimed at himself; it was an insinuation that *his* principles were not known, that he was a man without principles. And he takes occasion, in order to prevent the subject being further discussed, to state his own principles, in the course of a letter to the members of the Academy which had rejected him. He begins with some statements which remind us of Molière's Don Juan; he puts forward some simple axioms of mathematics. These are his principles. As for the more difficult ones, such as "that two and two make four," he holds them indeed, but he is not sure of them. But there are different principles in different subjects. There are principles of grammar, for example; but on them he need not touch. The gentlemen with whom he is comparing himself know neither Greek nor Latin. So he passes on to speak with the same sincerity on religion, and morals, and politics. Of his religion, he says, mockingly, that his principles are the same as those of his nurse, who died a Christian and a Catholic, quite unsuspected of heresy. He is himself only a soldier and a wood-cutter, and therefore orthodox, as men of his station in life ought to be. Of his morals he speaks more seriously. His one principle is to do nothing to another which he would not wish another to do to him. For his political principles he wishes to say little. He is afraid of being misunderstood, for the terms of a political creed are not very fixed, and he might be confounded with persons who wholly differ from him. One thing only he will say. He does not wish to be made king, and he is taking no steps to become so—a rare quality in the present age, and one which marks him off from all parties whatever.

If we interpret all this by the light which we may gain from Courier's life, and Courier's other writings, we shall find it expresses truly enough what he really thought and practised. He did not wish to meddle in politics, or to ally himself with any party, caring as he did only for results, and indifferent about forms of government. On matters of religion he was probably a positive thinker, but very tolerant to those who differed from him, provided always that they in their turn were tolerant to others. And he was a thoroughly good man, ready at all times to fight the battles of the weak who had no other supporter, and exposing himself to serious risks as their champion: and willing to suffer a real persecution himself rather than allow others to be persecuted, if his terrible pen could be of any aid to them. Such was the real man who now came forward as a pamphleteer; but with a perfect literary art, and a style which France had not known since Fénélon and La Fontaine and Voltaire.

The character in which he presented himself was a singular one. Paul Louis, Vigneron, is his favourite signature. He speaks and writes as a simple, honest countryman, living by the work of his hands on his little patrimony by the Loire, and using the language of common life, and common sense, to ordinary men like himself. He takes pleasure, too, now in speaking of himself as an old soldier of the Empire, and particularly in recalling his early services in the army which had beaten back the invaders from the French frontiers. We know what his services were, and the kind of distinction he succeeded in winning for himself as a soldier, and we should not probably rank them very high; but the character he assumed was a popular one, and his antecedents were not very strictly inquired into. His literary pursuits, he wished it to be understood, were the amusement of his leisure hours. He had been a soldier; he was now a vine-dresser, and he had neither time nor taste for letters. There was a matter now and then on which he wished to address others, but when these occurred his language was not that of the Court, but of the country. His readers were to think of him as an old soldier, living on his farm, and writing, as other men might write, a plain statement of facts, or of the sentiments of every-day life. The art with which this was done was as perfect as that of the "Drapier's Letters," the language and the moral purpose were far higher.

During the years that had passed since his retirement from the army, his reputation as a writer had deservedly made great progress. In his own style he was without a rival, and his style was not an easy one to employ successfully. "Men talk," he says, "of writing common sense as the best way of getting a hearing, as if common sense were so ordinary a gift, or so easy to put on paper." The best testimony to its difficulty is the fact that so few have succeeded in writing it. But how much more difficult to conceal the perfection of art under an affectation of mere common sense; to put the language of Demosthenes into the mouth of a vine-dresser, and to exhaust every artifice of literature without departing for a moment from the language of common life. The power to do this is the rarest of literary gifts, and Courier had it in perfection. His writings had already shown it; but all that he had hitherto written was thrown into the shade by a short pamphlet on a proposal by the Minister of the Interior to raise a national subscription for the purchase of Chambord for the infant Duke of Bordeaux. The pamphlet appeared under the title of "Simple Discours de Paul Louis, Vigneron," and before long it had gained such a reputation as to

embroil its author very seriously with the Government.

"If we had money," he commences, "that we did not know what to do with, if all our debts were paid, our roads repaired, our poor relieved, &c., I think, my friends, that it would be right to subscribe with our neighbours to rebuild the bridge of St. Avertin, which would considerably shorten the distance between us and Tours, and so improve the value and the produce of land in all these quarters. This is, I think, the best way in which we could employ our useless money, when we had any. But to buy Chambord for the Duke of Bordeaux I am not in favour of that, and I should not wish it if we had the means of doing it, the matter being, as I think, bad for him, for us, and for Chambord. For the courtiers it would be, no doubt, the best thing possible. They have good reason to wish for it. But not for the prince. He would gain our money, but he would lose a hundredfold our love; and though the bargain seems a golden one, though we pay and he only takes, yet Chambord, so acquired, would cost him too dear. Princes are rich only in the love of their subjects. It is not his friends who are advising this course, but rather some clever enemy.

"And who is it, I ask, who has given this wonderful advice? 'The idea has been suggested,' says the minister. Suggested by whom? Not by the minister; he would have let us know if it had been so; he would not have been content with the honour of approving it. Is it the prince? God forbid that this should have been the earliest thought of his life—that such a wish should have occurred to him before he has learned to wish for toys and *bonbons*. The *communes* then? Not ours, certainly, on this side of the Loire; but those perhaps which have twice quartered the Cossacks of the Don. Here we feel but little the benefits of the Holy Alliance, but there they have enjoyed it fully; they have had Sacken and Platow among them, and naturally *their* first thought is to purchase castles for their princes; when they have done this, they will repair their houses afterwards.

"Well, the idea has been suggested, whoever was its author, and our business is not with the credit of the suggestion, but with paying for carrying it out. 'Sir, all is yours,' is the language of the courtiers to their sovereign; but they give all to their King, just as the priests give all to God. The civil list and the royal domain no more belong to the King than the revenue of the abbeys does to Jesus Christ. Buy Chambord, and make a present of it. The court will devour it. The prince will be no better and no worse off than before. These fine ideas of making us pay come always from the courtiers. They know what they are doing when they offer the prince our money.

"If the question, now, had been about our subscribing to send the Duke to college, I would have consented willingly, and voted whatever was asked, if it had cost me my best crop of clover. The eldest son of the Duke of Orleans is there—a new thing for persons of rank. There is no favouritism there, and no flattery. Things are called by their true names. There is no one to tell a young prince that all belongs to him. He must take his place with the rest, and learn what they learn, and contend with them for the same prizes. We should have no *dragonnades*, no St. Bartholomew Massacres, if princes were thus brought up.

"But at Chambord what would he learn? He would have his ancestors there as his models, and I prefer that he should live with us rather than with his ancestors. On all sides he will see portraits of royal mistresses, and there will be plenty of persons to tell him what they mean. There Louis, the mode of all kings, lived (such is the Court phrase) with Madame Montespan, with Mademoiselle La Vallière, with all the married women and maids which it was his good pleasure to take away from their husbands and their relations. It was the time then of morals and of religion, and he took the Holy Communion every day. By this door his mistress entered in the evening, and in the morning his confessor. Hither came a girl to ask her father's life, and she paid the price for it, and obtained it from Francis, who died here of his good morals. These are the lessons which the young prince would learn at Chambord.

"The duke then can gain nothing from Chambord; but for us, who are to pay for it, how does the matter stand for us? We shall have more than one evil to endure, and not least of them, the near neighbourhood of the court. Let us give the great their due, but let us keep ourselves as far from them as we can, and take care, too, that they keep themselves far from us. They *can* hurt us, but they can do us no good. You know how they behave to us, and what good neighbours they are. If they are young, they hunt over our wheat, make gaps in our hedges, spoil our ditches, do us harm in a thousand ways. And if you make any complaint about it, if you go to the magistrate for redress—you shall tell me your success when you have come out of prison. If they are old, the case is still worse. They bring actions against us, ruin us by process of law, and sentence is pronounced by *gentlemen*, who dine with them, men of worth as they are, incapable of eating meat on a Friday, or of missing mass; and these men think that they are doing a good act in adjudging your property to the nobles,—that they are reconstituting the *ancien régime*. If the presence of one of these men is more than you can tolerate, if one of them can make you leave your district, how would it be if you had a court at Chambord, all the great together in a body around one greater than themselves. There are inconveniences, my friends, in the near neighbourhood of a court. To live there, a man should be either a servant or a beggar.

"You would become both before long. Living near them, you would soon learn the ways of those about them. Everybody at court is a servant, or wishes to be one. And begging is no shame at court; it is the life of a courtier. He watches the proper time for it, as you do the time for sowing your harvest, ay, and better. He never loses courage. If we had half his constancy in our work, our granaries could never hold our crops. No insult, no outrage can repel him. *Strike if you will, but listen to me*, and give me something. There is no service too vile for him. The man is yet to be found who can invent one that a courtier would, I do not say refuse, but one that he would not consider a glory and a sign of his devotedness. And a nice example all this would be for you, and for your sons and daughters.

"Now try a little to imagine what the court is. It is an honest place, if you will, but it is a strange place nevertheless. I do not know much about the court of the present day, but I know—who does not know?—the court of the great Louis Quatorze, the model of all courts, the court *par excellence*. There are curious facts about it, men's way there of living with their wives, for example. Every woman there was the wife of one man and the mistress of all, and stories abound that prove it to us. There was a community established, that marriages and other arrangements did not interfere with.

"You find it impossible, my friends, to believe in such a life as this. No single family, you think, could exist with it, and what must it be where it is the life of all families? Well, you are right. It

would ruin your families, but not theirs. They depend, not as yours do, on the husband's industry, but on the wife's favours. It has been women who have founded all our great houses; not, as you may suppose, by making their husbands' shirts or nursing their children. An honest woman is a treasure in our families; but what could a courtier do with one? Poor fellow! he would see favours showered all around him, and would get nothing himself. In a word, just as for us low-born fellows there is only one road to fortune, work; so there is only one for the nobility, *et c'est—c'est la prostitution, puisqu'il faut, mes amis, l'appeler par son nom.* And when our children have found out this, when they have found the way of getting rich without labour, would they be contented then to live as they do now? Thanks to the kindness of heaven, we have no court near us; and we, who are removed from this pollution, are we to pay to have one at our door? God forbid."

Such is the subject of some portion of this remarkable "discourse." We have done but partial justice to the matter; the style of it is inimitable. It was soon followed by a "Petition to the Chamber of Deputies for Villagers who were not allowed to Dance,"—a lighter and less elaborate pamphlet, but full of the same language about courts and princes, and very contemptuous towards the clergy, by whose agency the said prohibition had been obtained. Courier was called by the Government to account for both these publications, but first and principally for the "Simple Discours." He has himself left us a long account of the course of his trial, the "Procès de Paul Louis Courier," and of the speech which he would have made in his own defence, if his friends had permitted him. To those who read the matter of the accusation, the answers of the accused, and the speeches of the advocates on either side, the defence appears abundantly established, or rather it is difficult to find in what the legal offence can have consisted. But the court and courtiers were furious at the satire; the president was the creature of the court; the jury were sensible middle-class Frenchmen, worthy men, and at about the same level of intelligence as sensible middle-class Englishmen. Courier was brought in guilty of offending public morality, and was condemned to a fine of two hundred francs, and two months' imprisonment.

The rest of Courier's writings were, however, directed mainly to the same objects as the "discours." Among them we may mention, as deserving especial notice, the "Petition pour les Villageois que l'on empêche de Danser," and the "Réponse aux Lettres Anonymes adressées à Paul Louis Courier." We find throughout the same hatred of tyrannical restrictions, the same opposition to the clergy as a party dominant in the State, the same love of liberty and sympathy with natural and innocent pleasures, the same chivalrous eagerness to defend those who were unable to defend themselves, and had no other helper, and above all, the same genuine kindliness of heart and of purpose, which we find in almost every page that he has written. But the second series of the "Réponses aux Lettres Anonymes" rises above all that had gone before it. It reaches even to the "*grand style*;" it is eloquence of the first order. The subject of it is mainly the consequences in France of the confessional, and of the enforced celibacy of the clergy.

Our space does not permit us to go more fully into these and into others of Courier's writings. But we must mention at least the titles of the "Gazette du Village," in part humorous, in part, too, fearfully tragical; of the "Pièce Diplomatique," supposed to be an intercepted letter from Louis XVIII. to his Catholic Majesty the King of Spain; and lastly of the "Pamphlet des Pamphlets," the best of Courier's writings, from which the passage is taken with which our article is headed. He had already written the remarkable, the almost prophetic words—the warning he had received from a friend during his morning's walk in the Palais Royal: "*Prends garde, Paul Louis, prends garde! Les cagots te feront assassiner.*" The *livret* which contains this passage was published in 1823. On the 10th of April, 1825, Courier was fired at a few steps from his own door, and was taken up dead. The author and the motive of the deed remain still alike unknown.

Courier is gone. Cut off, as he was, in his fiftieth year, and in the full vigour of his powers, he yet left his work already done, his services to mankind already fully rendered. For these, persecuted in his life, he has received after his death the gratitude and honour he has deserved. His style is comparatively a small matter; but for that alone, as a most perfect literary model, he would be as immortal as the language in which he wrote. The friend of the oppressed, the enemy of all oppressors; the fearless champion of political and religious freedom, looking ever forward with faith and hope to the coming destinies of the world, and to the fuller enlightenment, and fuller liberty of the future—these are his best titles to immortality; by these he has earned a name that must live for ever in the grateful memory of posterity, in whose destinies he had confidence—of mankind, whom it was his object to benefit. A longer life might have enabled him to do more for others: it could have added nothing to his reputation, which is secure for ever, based upon the possession of the highest powers, consecrated to the noblest of all aims—to the service of humanity.

ART. VII.—COMMONS ROUND LONDON.

1. *Reports of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Cultivation and Improvement of Waste Lands.* 1797 and 1798.
2. *Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the means of Facilitating the Inclosure and Improvement of Waste Lands.* 1800.
3. *Reports of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Open Spaces (Metropolis).* 1865.

THE growth of that incoherent aggregation of

villages which we call London is daily bringing up fresh problems for solution. It would be difficult under any circumstances to compress a nation within the limits of a city without causing much inconvenience. But the difficulty is increased tenfold by the incapacity of our municipal institutions to conform to circumstances. London is compelled to expand, not like a vertebrate animal, by a uniform development of all its parts, but like a creature of the lowest order of existence, by throwing out a series of imperfectly organized growths. It is, perhaps, needless to remark that this irrational state of things is not a legitimate consequence of any principle of self-government. It is not that the sphere of government is too narrow, but that it is divided and parcelled out amongst too many, and too feeble authorities. In any country where the adaptation of institutions to circumstances is not tempered by a superstitious regard for vested rights and ancient corporations, the city which is a unit by its geography is also allowed to be a unit for administrative purposes, and certainly without any evil consequence to its independence. In fact, the impotence of our local centres of authority compels the constant interference of the national authority in matters which are properly of merely local interest. To settle such purely municipal questions as the main drainage and the Thames embankment, Parliament had to create a new authority, and afterwards could not refrain from meddling—not always successfully—with its action. The evils which result from the curiously complicated system of jurisdictions under which we live, have been often enough illustrated, and are indeed obvious to the eyes and noses of us all. London is allowed to develop according to its own sweet will, without any attempt at providing against the dangers of the future. Railways have been permitted to cut their way through populous districts, and to force back the displaced inhabitants into streets already overflowing; and no care has been taken to render the transition to the new state of things as easy as possible. There has indeed been, of late, a revolt against the tyranny of railway companies, but the want of any central will or intellect must always give advantage to the assaults of interested persons upon interests which there is no one to look after.

The state of the commons round London is an illustration of this very obvious truth. By a piece of good fortune there are still a number of unenclosed pieces of wild land within the Metropolitan District. Fragments, as it were, of moor and heath lie at our very doors, and a few years ago they still remained in a position of apparent security. The transformation which London is undergoing, no less than Paris, though after a different fashion, is bringing many of them into jeopardy. It is curious to remark the various gradations by which London fades into the country, or as we should more accurately say, by which the country is gradually swallowed up in London. The main army is preceded by an advance of villas, thrown out like skirmishers. They begin by seizing a few picked positions, but are to be found, as their numbers increase, wandering off into the fields, where they can only be approached along muddy and unlighted lanes. Then come the more solid ranks of the semi-detached, forming in continuous lines along the high roads and in the neighbourhood of railway stations. They are followed by rows of shops, generally headed by an enterprising gin-palace, which bind together the more irregular forces and complete the army of occupation. We find some morning that a town has grown up which has a physiognomy peculiar to these suburban districts. For it is evidently no articulate whole, but a mere fragment, which will soon be assimilated by the advancing mass behind. The houses, too, have that cramped and mean appearance which speaks of pressure in the dingy crowds of London. They bear the stamp of their origin, and show in contrast with the remaining fragments of picturesque old country houses as a Cockney would show amongst the gathering of a Highland clan. Of course these houses, and streets, and towns have a tendency to congregate round the commons. The pieces of wild land are gradually surrounded with a girdle of town houses, which seem to look down upon them with a show of town-bred arrogance. The common becomes an island in the dingy ocean of coal-smoke, and, unfortunately is too often in danger of being entirely engulphed by the rising tide of bricks and mortar. It has seldom or never happened, indeed, that a common has been swallowed up wholesale, for reasons which we shall presently have occasion to notice. Small outlying fragments, however, are frittered away; squatters effect settlements upon them; and the enemy succeeds in establishing a lodgment. Meanwhile, nuisances of various kinds grow up: the drainage is left to take care of itself; the surface is degraded in a variety of ways; heaps of rubbish are shot upon it; gravel-pits are dug without the smallest regard to its beauty or convenience; and as the police are not responsible for preserving order and decency upon it, it becomes in some cases a resort of bad characters. By these means the common, which was formerly an ornament to the neighbourhood, and which a little foresight might have converted into a permanent reservoir of fresh air and country beauty, degenerates into a nuisance. The immediate interest of a whole army of spoilers is allowed to prevail over the interests of the population at large, which are watched by no intelligent guardian; and before public attention has been aroused the evil may be consummated. Even if the common still remains unenclosed, it may have been so damaged that its enclosure is no longer regarded as an evil.

There are, however, symptoms that Londoners are beginning to awake to their danger. The case of Wimbledon Common last year drew attention to some of the more important considerations involved. Wimbledon is, without doubt, one of the most beautiful of our commons. The furze-covered slopes of the hill fronting Combe Wood, with their miniature glens and broken undulations of ground, have a peculiar attraction. They are in pleasant con-

trast to the more formal graces of the neighbouring Richmond Park. Fortunately, too, they had stronger claims upon public interest than any derivable from mere beauty of landscape. Artists might admire them; but artists have as yet established no *locus standi* to resist the encroachments of builders or of railways upon their favourite haunts. Luckily the preservation of Wimbledon Common is almost indispensable for the interests of the volunteers. There is no body which is pinched more to the quick than the volunteers by the growing pressure of population; although in this they are only most conspicuous representatives of all those to whom air and exercise are becoming daily more valuable and more difficult to obtain. The difficulty of obtaining anything like satisfactory rifle ranges is so great, and the distances which have to be travelled in order to obtain them increase so fast, as to be a severe discouragement upon the practice of shooting. But it is also becoming difficult to obtain a fair space for drilling. A few companies may contrive to make some sort of shift in the backyards and sheds to which London volunteers are ordinarily doomed. But there is no place within a moderate distance of London where more than a battalion or two can be manœuvred with anything like the facilities obtainable at Wimbledon. Hence any blow aimed at the common would instantaneously cripple the London volunteers. With the common would perish the only space where field-days can be held on a satisfactory scale, and the only space where the National Rifle Association could hold its meetings. Its enclosure would have the same effect upon them as the closing of their last breathing-holes would have upon fish in a frozen pond. There was, therefore, no common round London whose integrity would be guarded with more eager jealousy; and the inhabitants of the neighbourhood are of that class who are able to make their voices heard in Parliament, and, if necessary, to provide means for a legal contest. The proposal made by Lord Spencer in the last session was therefore received with great interest, as it was avowedly, and no doubt sincerely, intended to reconcile the interests of the commoners and the lord of the manor. Wimbledon consists of about 1000 acres: of these it was proposed to sell 300, or so much of them as should be sufficient to compensate all the persons concerned, and pay the necessary expenses. The remainder of the common was to be surrounded with a fence, to be drained and reduced to the likeness of a park; a house was to be built in the centre, to be occupied by the "Protector," the name under which Lord Spencer and succeeding lords of the manor were to be the supreme rulers of this little domain. Lord Spencer, in making this proposal, undoubtedly conceived himself to be making a generous offer; but the value of his concession of course depended upon the nature of the rights which he abandoned. If it had been in his power to sell the whole, or nearly the whole common, for building land, then he would have deserved due gratitude for the generosity which secured so large a fraction for public purposes. If, on the other hand, he had no legal power to sacrifice a single acre to the builder, it was plain enough that the last state of the common, as contemplated in his scheme, was worse than the first. Now, as the commoners took the narrower view of the lord's rights, whilst Lord Spencer approximated more nearly to the broader, it is not surprising that they received his offer with small show of gratitude. He was, in their opinion, only granting to them a part of what was theirs already; they decidedly objected to selling any part of the common; they objected also to the proposed enclosure; they very much preferred the present wild growth of fern and gorse to the new park, with its central "protectoral" residence. They maintained that the really necessary drainage might be accomplished at a very trifling expense, which could be raised without a sale of any part of the land; and, on the whole they very decidedly requested to be let alone, except so far as measures for the preservation of the common were necessary. The committee of the House of Commons, to which the question was referred, so far adopted their views as to declare that no inclosure was desirable; and the proposal for any permanent settlement of the matter dropped through, leaving the common, for the present, in the same state as before. The committee, however, took evidence as to the state of many of the other commons round London, and proposed a general plan for securing them in their present integrity. The various complaints which were made illustrate forcibly the complication of evils which commons in these days are heirs to. Some are threatened with instant annihilation; others are gradually perishing by an insidious process of consumption; and most of them are suffering from diseases which are rapidly spoiling their remaining charms. We may give an instance or two of the various fates with which they are threatened. It is unnecessary to go over again the story of Hampstead Heath, which has long been the object of assault, and which has been so far preserved (possibly at some expense to private interests) by the vigilance of Parliament; on the death of the present lord of the manor, his successor will probably claim a right to cut up the whole of it into building plots. Sir Thomas Wilson stated very frankly before the Committee that he should simply consider how he could best improve Hampstead Heath for his own advantage. He considered himself to have been already seriously aggrieved; the public had, in his view, no rights whatever upon the heath; and he would enter into no arrangement with regard to it. He had once intended to lay out Hampstead Heath as a recreation-ground for his own houses. Now, he said, he might, if he chose, "turn it into an Agar Town"—Agar Town being a place where cottages have been built on short leases for poor people. We express no opinion upon the grievance to which Sir Thomas Wilson conceives himself to have been subjected; but it is pretty clear that if he can establish his view of the legal rights of the question, the public hold upon one of the most delightful of London recreation grounds is, to say the least, precarious. In fact, it is only reasonable to presume that lords of manors will,

as a rule, take the most extended view of their rights, and will endeavour to enforce them by all means in their power. On the assumption, however, that they may find their view of the matter to be erroneous, it does not at all follow that commons will escape unscathed. Commons have strong attractions for various other classes of depredators. One example will show the nature of the most flagrant evils. According to the evidence of Mr. Rose, who has some property adjoining Wandsworth Common, that common has been undergoing a rapid degradation for several years past. Thirteen years ago it was kept in a satisfactory state, under an arrangement similar to one still in force and still producing satisfactory results at Clapham. A certain number of the inhabitants had a lease from Lord Spencer, the lord of the manor, and kept the common in order for public use and recreation. They dug gravel at certain points, so as to make ornamental pieces of water in the places from which it was excavated, and to allow the water from the common to drain off satisfactorily. It was then, as Clapham still is, a beautiful oasis of country scenery in the outskirts of the metropolitan wilderness. For some reason or other the lease was terminated. The common was neglected; gravel was dug at random, without any regard to its beauty or convenience; and a series of inclosures gradually came cranking in and cut "monstrous cantles" out. The irresistible powers who have been cutting and slashing the map of London according to their will, were not long in claiming their share of the spoils. Two or three railway companies in succession fell upon the devoted common, the danger of whose position may be inferred from the immediate vicinity of that mysterious station, Clapham Junction, whence, to the bewildered mind of the passengers, every railway in England seems to radiate. A space of open land was too tempting not to invite attack. The South-Western Railway seized a fragment; the Crystal Palace Railway appropriated 29 acres; and the London, Brighton, and South Coast 7 acres. Besides encroachments pure and simple, the inclosures made under Lord Spencer's authority appear to have amounted to 140 acres; of which, whatever consolation the public may derive from that fact, the greater part have been granted to charitable institutions. If our pockets are picked, it is of course gratifying to know that the money has been put into a missionary-box; and we may take some comfort in the thought that we are being ousted from our scanty supplies of green grass and fresh air by the boys of the Patriotic School. The mere diminution in area of the common is by no means the only evil. The remnant which is left to us is deteriorated. Railways and other intruders, like the Harpies, spoil the fragments of the feast which they do not touch. Thus all the public footpaths across the common, with one exception, have been stopped up. The space formerly used as a cricket-ground has become useless, and in Mr. Rose's language—

"Wandsworth Common is a morass now; it has been excavated to such an extent that the whole of the space from Nightingale-lane up the centre of the common is under water all the winter; it was under water up to the 20th of March, when I was there, and is now (April, '64) to a considerable extent; and although in the summer the water soaks away, it leaves the common in a very bad state, so that it cannot be used for any purpose."

As an illustration of the results of excavating gravel in a reckless way, Mr. Rose mentions that he, with two of his neighbours, took the dead body of a man out of one of the pits, which had been placed (as traps are set for elephants in Africa) in the direction of a public path, the water being at such a level that he could not reach up to the bank. Lord Spencer's agent, who appeared before the committee, did not dispute the existence of these grievances but the responsibility of Lord Spencer. He mentioned an additional evil, which results from the inability of the police to exercise authority upon the common, except in the case of an actual breach of the peace. He stated that there were loose women living upon the common who had no other home, and who insulted and annoyed people as they went about. The encroachments by which the common has been mangled appear in some cases to have been made without any sort of claim; but the commoners are disloyal enough to their feudal superior to doubt the legality even of those sanctioned by his authority. They venture to say that they consider these inclosures to be disastrous to the neighbourhood altogether, and have "a strong sense that they are done illegally, and contrary to law and justice." These misguided men will be finding fault with the British Constitution next. They entertain, however, a strong opinion that it is impossible for a poor man, or even for a rich man, having a right, successfully to contest an inclosure; and as Wandsworth is a poor parish the various inclosures have been allowed to pass without protest.

It might be hoped that the abuses of which Wandsworth is a most flagrant case would be avoided in cases where the Crown is lord of the manor; it might be anticipated that its powers would be used to secure a more satisfactory state of things. If a lord of the manor prefers his own interests to the interests of the public, the public cannot be surprised. But the interests of the Crown are presumed to be those of the public. Blackheath, which is in this position, should therefore be a model common, especially as it is one of the rare breathing spaces upon which the crowded population of the East end congregates with most eagerness. It is stated that as many as 80,000 people have gone to Blackheath upon Easter Monday and Tuesday. Now the heath is stated to have very much deteriorated during the last few years. The principal causes of this are the absence of all control, and the gradual breaking up of the surface by digging for gravel. Booths and photographic vans, and other habitations of our nomad population form temporary settlements, which tend to disfigure the beauty of the heath. The Hon. C. Gore was examined upon this point, and stated that the Crown received 56*l.* a-year from the

gravel, besides 1*l.* from a photographer, 4s. 6d. a-year from the Blackheath Improvement Association for certain posts and rails, and 1*l.* a-year for a tool-shed belonging to the man who digs gravel. Part of this princely revenue is raised to prevent any one from encroaching on the Crown rights; the 56*l.* is raised at an expense, as we have seen, of serious injury to the Heath. Mr. Gore was asked whether it was not his duty, as trustee for the Crown, to see that whilst the revenue was raised the comforts of the people were not interfered with. He answers, "I do not see what right I have to forego the public revenue that is derived from Crown lands for any local purpose, however beneficial the purpose in itself may be." This enlightened policy, by which the nation at large realizes 56*l.* annually at the expense of a permanent injury to a London common, is carried out on a nobler scale in the case of Epping. A committee of the House of Commons, in 1863, stated that there were two courses which might be followed with regard to the forestal rights: the first was to discontinue the sale of those rights, and to maintain them vigilantly without regard to cost, in order to prevent future inclosures, and preserve the forest in its wild state; the other was to obtain the sanction of Parliament for the inclosure of the forest by sale of rights, and otherwise "to secure an adequate portion for purposes of health and recreation." The committee recommended this last plan, as, in their view, the use of such rights to prevent inclosure was of questionable justice. The House of Commons, however, passed a resolution recommending that no sales of forestal rights should be made to facilitate inclosures within fifteen miles of the metropolis. The result of this resolution was singular. The Commissioners of Woods and Forests discontinued the sale of rights; but, after taking a legal opinion, they decided that it would not pay to take legal steps against encroachments already made. The pecuniary value of the rights preserved would be more than swallowed up by the law expenses; and as they look at the question as simply a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence (and, we may add, very few pounds and shillings), they declined to take any steps against encroachments. The result of the House of Commons' resolution thus appears to be, not that no further encroachments are made, but that we receive nothing for them; the rights are appropriated instead of bought. Now Epping is a beautiful open tract of country within a few miles of the most crowded part of London.

These will be sufficient examples of the chief dangers by which commons in the neighbourhood of London are surrounded, and of the spirit in which they are generally met. It is scarcely necessary to dwell upon the importance of preserving these open spaces, nor to point out that those in the metropolitan district have especial claims upon us. The destruction, indeed, of commons in the country districts is one which it is not possible to contemplate with entire equanimity, attracted as we may be by the promise of increased production. We are all treading too closely upon each other's toes in this little island of ours, not to grudge the closing of any interstice which yet remains unfilled. When men inhabited little oases of cultivated land in the midst of a wilderness, the sight of uninclosed land was a vexation of spirit. The case is now reversed—we value a bit of unbroken ground as our ancestors valued a garden. In the words of Mr. Mill, in one of those eloquent passages which stand out from the philosophic calm of his ordinary writing:—

"There is not much satisfaction in contemplating the world with nothing left to the spontaneous activity of nature; with every rood of land brought into cultivation which is capable of growing food for human beings; every flowery waste or natural park ploughed up, all quadrupeds or birds which are not domesticated for man's use exterminated as his rivals for food, and scarcely a place left where a wild shrub or flower could grow without being eradicated as a weed in the name of improved agriculture."

It is not impossible, indeed, that in the power of that name injury may be done, not only in a sentimental, but in a very prosaic point of view. The improvement of agriculture is not always synonymous with the improvement of those who live by agriculture; and there is reason to suppose that in the war against the waste lands a larger part of the spoil has somehow fallen to the share of the rich men among the conquerors than of their poorer allies—a result not quite without analogy in other cases. Professor Fawcett, in his lectures on the "Economic Position of the British Labourer," speaks of some of the unfortunate results that have ensued to particular classes, from a process intented to increase the general wealth of the nation:—

"The commons," he says, "are now being rapidly swept away. Cottagers have now no means of keeping a cow, a pig, or poultry; the village games are gone; every acre of ground is carefully fenced; the beaten path of the frequented highway cannot be left without committing the crime and incurring the penalties of trespass, and I have been too often pained to find that the turnpike road is now the only recreation ground for village children."

Mr. Fawcett shows some reason for doubting whether in point of fact the destruction of commons has increased the material wealth of the country. But the effects upon the poorer classes have generally been of unmixed evil. Some inadequate compensation was generally awarded, which was spent by those who received it. The next generation had simply descended a step in the scale; they were in the position of their predecessors, *minus* these common rights, which had formed an inalienable piece of property; the labourers, as he remarks, had formerly the special advantage in the right to keep cows or poultry, that they could enjoy luxuries which daily wages never placed within their reach. "Every one," he says, "who knows the working classes will tell you how much their children suffer when they are unable to obtain milk, as some additional nourishment to their scanty food."

It may therefore be maintained that the inclosure of waste lands beyond a certain limit

has been far from an unmixed advantage; even if the productive powers of the country have been increased, the benefits have been by no means equally distributed. The increase of agricultural power *per se* would of course be a clear gain; the man who makes two blades grow where one grew before, is, we know, a benefactor to his country, unless, indeed, he accomplishes the proverbial feat at his neighbour's expense. But it is important to remark, first, that this argument, whatever its worth, has no application to the metropolitan commons; and secondly, that it was the sole ground of the legislation by which inclosure elsewhere was made practicable. The first Inclosure Acts were founded on reports made by select committees of the House of Commons in the years 1795, 1797, and 1800. Anxiety was felt at that time on account of the scarcity of corn. The sums paid for corn imported in three years had amounted to over 7,000,000*l.*, and according to the political economy of the day, the last committee pointed out that this turned the balance of trade against this country, besides producing various other evils. They calculated that a cultivation of 148,000 acres additional would be sufficient to raise as much corn as had been imported on an average of the last twenty years. On the other hand, they estimated that there were in England and Wales nearly eight million, and in Scotland over fourteen million acres of waste and uninclosed lands. After allowing for land which was either unimprovable or only partly improvable, they calculated the value of the annual produce which might be raised from these lands at 20,000,000*l.* yearly. They reported in 1795 that there was reason to believe that the waste lands might not only be speedily brought into cultivation, but might even be improved so as to increase the stock of provisions within the next two years, and "more particularly to furnish a very large additional supply of potatoes." They further argued that inclosure would be favourable to an increased growth of men as well as of corn and potatoes. The purpose, then, of the first inclosure Acts was purely agricultural; it was to meet a great strain upon the resources of the country during the early period of the French war by increasing the area of cultivable land. It was intended to raise larger supplies of food, and was passed in the interests of the country at large, not of private owners. As the national wealth would receive an infinitesimal improvement by ploughing up Wimbledon Common or covering Hampstead Heath with villas, it is plain that the precedent has no application. If, that is, the interference of Parliament is necessary in order to facilitate the inclosure of the metropolitan commons, no sort of claim can be founded upon these inclosure Acts for legislative assistance. The measure was not designed merely with a view to help private persons to an easy mode of dividing property amongst themselves, but distinctly and principally because the inclosure was proved to be of the highest importance to the national welfare. The legal obstacles which impeded a division of common lands amongst persons interested might, for anything that appears, have been left untouched, if the national welfare had not been concerned; and might have been scrupulously maintained, if the national welfare had, as now, been concerned on the other side.

It is necessary to observe what were the difficulties which had made the inclosure of commons almost impracticable. The statute most commonly referred to as justifying the principle of inclosure is the 20 Henry III., c. 4, commonly called the Statute of Merton. This ancient and all but extinct statute provides that "because many great men of England have complained that they cannot make their profit of the residue of their manors, as of wastes, woods, and pastures," the lords may, as it is technically called, "approve," or inclose the waste, after leaving sufficient pasture to satisfy the rights of the commoners. This statute had, however, become practically obsolete. The lords had, it may be presumed, taken advantage of the statute by enclosing the "residue," which was not required to satisfy the claims of the commoners. It was rare to find any common sufficiently extensive to leave a surplus of any importance. Moreover, it was difficult for the lord to prove (and the burden of proof rested with him) that he had left a sufficiency of pasture; finally, where there were rights of "turbary" or "estovers,"—that is, of cutting turf or wood—the lord could not approve any part of the waste. As the commoners grew rich, it became more difficult for the lord to come to terms with them, the rights of rich men having a decided tendency to gain consistency. Commons could only be inclosed by the unanimous consent of all persons concerned. And thus for a long time previous to the inclosure Acts of this century, inclosures had only been practically effected by means of private legislation. This process, however, was so expensive and troublesome, that the number of Acts was beginning to decrease; and as, for the reasons we have noticed, it was thought of great importance to the public interest that the process of inclosure should be accelerated, the necessary machinery was provided by the different inclosure Acts. The Inclosure Commissioners are applied to in the first instance by the persons interested. If the proposed inclosure appears to be advantageous in an agricultural point of view, and is supported by two-thirds of the interests concerned, it is then reported to Parliament and is generally passed as a matter of routine. The Act, however, recognises to a certain extent the existence of other than purely agricultural interests. The General Inclosures Act of 1845 provides that the Commissioners may insist upon an allotment for purposes of recreation and exercise, the extent of which is to be regulated in proportion to the population of the parish; the greatest quantity which can be thus alloted is ten acres. It is also provided that no inclosure shall take place under the Act within fifteen miles of the metropolis, or within certain distances of towns of a specified magnitude, without the previous sanction of Parliament in each particular case. Thus the inclosure of commons round London can only take place by some of the insidious processes which we have noticed; it is scarcely possible that the lord should obtain the consent

of every individual commoner, but many of the rights may gradually be extinguished by neglect, as the gradual progress of the metropolis deprives the pasture of its value; encroachments may be made which no one is willing to dispute, and afterwards justified under the obsolete authority of the Statute of Merton, and gradually the public may be ousted from the common before it knows that any assault has been made.

The question is thus raised, whether the public at large, or even the people of London, have any claim to be considered; or whether the commons are mere pieces of private property, which may be inclosed and built over whenever a few persons have contrived to settle their conflicting claims. It appears, at first sight, evident that Parliament has, in fact, recognised the principle that the neighbourhood has some kind of right to the commons. The refusal to facilitate inclosures within fifteen miles of London, and the order to set apart a space—though, in the case of large towns, a very inadequate space—to be used as a village green, no doubt proceeded on the assumption that the public had some rights of a more or less shadowy nature. It was not assumed that they had no more business to meddle with the question than with the sale of an ordinary freehold. Although the interests of the people at large are not very apt to deaden the lively affection which Parliament bears to lords of manors and landholders generally, they have in this instance been taken into account. No facilities have been given for inclosure, except on the distinct ground that national interests required it. And there is evidently no shadow of a claim for such facilities except where the same ground can be proved to exist. "Nothing can be clearer," says Mr. Joshua Williams, "both upon principle and by the usage of Parliament than this, that the interest of the public at large is a sufficient ground for denying to any person the assistance of a private Act." If the difficulties which have hitherto prevented the enclosure of commons were still sufficient to guard them near London, we might be content with this moderate concession. But it is plain that something more is wanted. Mere inaction is equivalent to permitting their destruction. Has then the public any legal right, not merely to refuse facilities for inclosure, but to insist upon the present open spaces being preserved? As we acquire a right of way along a path, may we not acquire by immemorial usage a right of straying over a common? Or, as a village is allowed the enjoyment of the green on which cricket and other games have been played, may not Wimbledon and Clapham be considered as village greens for the metropolis? They are certainly not too large in proportion. Here, however, the lawyers are shocked by the mention of such vague considerations as the public interest. They think that London is too big a place to have any rights, and that a right of exercise and recreation is too vague to be a right at all. It is true that Parliament has insisted upon village greens being set apart; but in so doing, it is argued, they recognised no rights; they were merely making a bargain; they were selling the facilities of inclosure for the permanent dedication of a fraction of the ground to the public. "We," they said in effect, "will help you to share your property, but you must give us a slice of it by way of fee." Persons coming to Parliament for assistance in enclosing commons were in the same position as railways asking for a compulsory Act for the sale of property, and any conditions which seemed good to Parliament might be imposed upon them. By this view, the right of the public, or of any part of it, to be heard in the question, is altogether put out of question. It is thus maintained that the public have no rights in commons. There may indeed be valid customs in particular places for the inhabitants of a town to enjoy recreation in certain lands. It has been held that a custom for all the inhabitants of a village to dance at all times of the year on a certain close was good. And it has been held that a custom for the freemen and citizens of a town to enter a close for the purpose of horse-racing on a particular day of the year is a good custom. But a general custom for all the Queen's subjects to attend a horse race at a particular place is considered to be bad, because the rights possessed by the Queen's subjects generally are part of the general law of the land, and not the custom of a particular place.

This distinction, by which the inhabitants of a village may obtain a right to play cricket or even to recreate themselves generally on their green, and the inhabitants of London can obtain no right to enjoy the little spaces of open ground left to them, however constantly they may have resorted to those spaces, seems rather unintelligible to the non-legal mind. The committee of last session remark forcibly that these opinions, even if judicially binding, seem to rest upon no very intelligible principle. "They are," they say, "at a loss to conceive why, upon general principles, a right of enjoyment which may be acquired by the inhabitants of a small hamlet should be denied to the inhabitants of the metropolis, or even to the general public." That such doctrines should commend themselves to the minds of lawyers, is indeed intelligible enough. The public is not likely to meet with such favour at their hands as are the lords of manors. A concrete person enjoying a clearly defined right is likely to have it all his own way in the courts, as against an abstraction called "the good of the public." But the more we examine into the origin of the right, the more probable it becomes that the lords have gained more than is equitably due to them. It is, in fact, merely an illustration of the process by which landed proprietors have gradually gained an absolute right, whilst throwing gradually aside all the duties to which their rights were formerly correlative. The nature of the change is explained in Mr. Maine's "Ancient Law." In discussing the question of the origin of primogeniture, Mr. Maine finds a key to the solution of the problem in a peculiarity of Hindoo institutions. In India, he says, the possessions of a parent are divisible at his death in equal shares among his children; but, "whatever *public office* or *political power* devolves at the decease of the last incumbent, the succession is nearly univer-

sally according to the rules of *primogeniture.* . . . . All offices in India tend to become hereditary, and, when their nature permits it, to vest in the eldest member of the oldest stock." Comparing this with the feudal organization, Mr. Maine points out that "the lord with his vassals, during the ninth and tenth centuries, might be considered as a patriarchal household, recruited, not as in the primitive times, by adoption, but by infeudation." When, in later times, "courts and lawyers were called in to interpret and define" the state of things of which this was the germ, they applied to it the refined principles of Roman jurisprudence. Here a change took place like that which has come to pass in later times in India, when the English conquerors, assuming the state of things with which they were conversant in England to be part of the eternal order of nature, proceeded to identify native tenures with their own—a process which, we need not say, sometimes involved gross injustice. In a patriarchally governed society, says Mr. Maine, "the eldest son may succeed to the government of the agnatic group and to the absolute disposal of his property. But he is not a true proprietor. He has correlative duties not involved in the conception of proprietorship, but quite undefined and quite incapable of definition." The later Roman jurisprudence could not recognise these liabilities: "it considered the uncontrolled power over property as equivalent to ownership;" and thus, "the contact of the refined and barbarous nation had inevitably for its effect the conversion of the eldest son into legal proprietor of the inheritance." And Mr. Maine proceeds to point out that the revolution thus effected was identical with that which has occurred in quite recent times in the Highlands of Scotland.

"When called in to determine the legal powers of the chieftain over the domains which gave sustenance to the clan, Scottish jurisprudence had long since passed the point at which it could take notice of the vague limitations in completeness of dominion imposed by the claims of the clansmen, and it was inevitable therefore that it should convert the patrimony of many into the estate of one."

The effect of this change in the Highlands is sufficiently well known. Those who were formerly possessed of a share in the patrimony have become encumbrances on the estate; and the representative of the chieftain of the clan has been able to improve his feudal inferiors off the face of Scotland. We need not inquire what may be the economical results of this change; but it certainly adds force to the argument that the possession of landed property should be held certain duties. The landholding class have neither toiled nor spun, but by the unobserved progress of affairs they have gradually become absolute proprietors without any responsibility, instead of leaders of a confederacy. It has thus become a legal doctrine that the lord has the right to everything upwards and downwards, except that which is carved out of his rights for some one else. The lords are absolute owners of the soil, it is said, subject only to the rights, whatever they may be, of the commoners.

So long, however, as the rights of the commoners survive, the lord is unable to take practical advantage of his theory by enclosing; but he is now endeavouring to take another step in advance. He has become a proprietor with certain claims upon his estate, instead of a political head with responsibilities corresponding to his privileges. The consequence is, that whenever the claimants drop off it is so much clear gain to him. If a common right is extinguished by disuse, the lord remains as a kind of universal heir. The public has been put entirely on one side. The lord remains immovable and eternal. A centralized government tends to become steadily stronger, because whenever a local institution loses its vitality, the central power is always at hand, ready to assume its privileges and to discharge its duties. The lord of the manor gradually becomes invested in the same way with additional rights. As London gradually extends its huge ramifications round the commons, the common rights become comparatively valueless. When a piece of land becomes open to the incursions of the British public at large, it naturally becomes impossible to turn out cows upon it to much effect. The grass is trampled down; gates across the public roads have to be removed to accommodate traffic, and cows take advantage of the case. In the case of Wimbledon, parts of the common have become dangerous from the erection of butts; and, in short, as the common takes on more of the character of a playground, it becomes less available for agricultural purposes. The consequence is, that there is a danger of the rights gradually dropping. When a man turns out his children upon the common instead of turning out his cows, the law does not admit that he is keeping up his claim. The persons who have in fact supplanted the commoners and have been allowed to exercise their rights, are the general public; the commoners have tacitly permitted them to take such advantage of the unenclosed state of the ground as to render it impossible to turn it to account in the ancient way. In the case of a few acres surrounded by a village, this would amount to a dedication to the public, and would be sufficient to secure the ground as an open space for ever. In the case of a common surrounded by the huge population of London, it is assumed that the public which has practically superseded the commoners is too vague a body to enjoy any rights, or to have anything dedicated to it; and consequently the whole benefit accrues to the lord of the manor. His estate is converted from a valueless bit of waste land into building ground of enormous value by the near approach of London; the same circumstance gradually pushes off his land all those inconvenient people whose claims were formerly sufficient to keep it open, and the whole of the benefit is supposed to go to him. Thus, to take one example, Mr. Thompson bought the common of Tooting, in 1861, for 3000*l.* He immediately set to work and made out, to his own satisfaction, that the common rights which existed

were imaginary; he maintains that there is only one man besides himself who has any right at all—a matter upon which the inhabitants take a very different view. In 1865 he values the common at 30,000*l.*, and takes much credit to himself for proposing to leave part of it open. Mr. Thompson may be justified in his opinion, although the commoners have hitherto refused to consent to the compromise which he has proposed. Indeed, it may be said in general that the opinions of lords of manors on one side and inhabitants on the other, as to their rights, always diverge in a manner which proves the unsettled state of the law upon the subject. The case seems to be that the rights of commoners have of late years been suffered gradually to evaporate, but have not so completely dispersed into thin air that their actual non-existence can be affirmed. Where the case has been tried, it has generally appeared that the lords of the manor have viewed their own rights in a large and generous spirit which has led them to neglect entirely those of their neighbours. And it is to be hoped that in the legal decisions which must be given before long upon some of these cases, where rival interests are coming into conflict, the lawyers will incline to a broader view of the matter than that which we have indicated. This is surely a case which eminently confirms the truth of Mr. Mill's saying: "To me it seems almost an axiom that property in land should be interpreted strictly, and that the balance, in all cases of doubt, should incline against the proprietor." The landed proprietor, as a rule, has nothing to do but to sit still and allow the general increase of population to raise his rents; in this case, the increase of population simultaneously clears off every one who has an interest in the land, except the lord of the manor, who receives the benefit both of the rise in the value of the land and of the extinction of all other shares in the property. He would lose nothing if the public at large were considered to be the heirs of the commoners, except that there would be a smaller chance of enclosing the common; but as this was impracticable in most cases so long as the common-rights were kept up, the value thus lost is really very small.

The practical steps which were proposed by the committee of last session, and which are embodied in a bill brought in by Mr. Cowper are simple, and need not offend the most sensitive stickler for vested interests. The first point is to map out accurately the limits of the existing commons. A board—either already existing, or newly constituted—is to be appointed to act as trustees for the preservation of commons. They are to inquire into the circumstances of the particular commons, to authorize drainage works and schemes for raising the necessary funds, to have a *locus standi* against all railway bills and similar measures, and to be authorized to accept grants of the rights of lords of manors and others. In this way it is hoped that, at any rate, the commons may not be frittered away without notice by the insidious means we have noticed. An accurate statement will be made of their present limits; the attacks of railways and the whole breed of depredators will be warded off, and the rights will be so ascertained as to facilitate permanent arrangements between the persons interested. We are glad, also, to hear that one lord at least, Mr. Alcock, has generously promised to grant to the board, if appointed, his rights over Banstead Downs, a beautiful tract of fourteen hundred acres in the neighbourhood of Epsom. It is hardly to be expected that this action will be followed in a similar spirit by many of the lords; it is probable that there must be litigation in many cases before matters are brought to a satisfactory conclusion; but, at any rate, it is highly important that something should be done at the earliest possible period. The commons are daily in greater danger from numerous enemies; the rights of commoners are gradually disappearing, and the rapacity of the various classes who would supersede them, is constantly receiving fresh stimulants. The injury already done to some of our beautiful commons is irreparable, and, without energetic action, others may share their fate. All classes are interested, both in preserving them for health and pleasure, but especially the poorest classes. We hope to see what remains of them placed beyond the reach of their enemies, if only as an affirmation of the principle that landowners are not to be allowed to extend their rights indefinitely, without any regard to the interests of the public.

Art. VIII.—H. Taine on Art and Italy.

1. *Philosophie de l'Art.* Par H. Taine. Leçons professées à l'Ecole des Beaux-Arts. Paris: Germer-Baillière. 1865.
2. *The Philosophy of Art.* Translated from the French, and Revised by the Author. London: Germer-Baillière. 1866.
3. *Voyage en Italie.* Par H. Taine. Tome I. *Naples et Rome.* Paris et Londres: L. Hachette et Cie. 1866.

To the diffusion of a knowledge of art, we owe the extinction of the professed connoisseur. Over the minds of our forefathers he exercised a dictatorial sway based on personal qualifications, of which the most marked was incompetence, and the most obnoxious was conceit. According to him a picture was valuable in proportion to its age. On the dark canvas he could detect the hand of the master, and the more the colours had faded and the outlines had disappeared, the more enchanted did he profess to be, and the more confident was he in his assertion that every man of taste must admit the picture to be from the hand of a "great master."

It is long since the English public first showed its credulity as to the excellence of a work of art which had any mark of antiquity upon it. Burton, in the introduction to his "Anatomy of Melancholy," likens some readers

to silly passengers who stand gazing "at an antick picture in a painter's shop, that will not look at a judicious peece." The connoissour of the last and the present century, in condemning what was modern and eulogizing what was old with the sagacity of a Dogberry and the confidence of a Sir Oracle, only did systematically that of which the public was ready to approve.

After a time the trick became too stale. When it was found that to repeat a few phrases, interspersed with *chiaroscuro*, *gusto*, *morbidezza*, "carnations," "middle distance," and other technicalities, was sufficient to constitute a connoisseur, the impostors outnumbered the dupes. So flagrant were the deceptions practised upon those who wished to pass for men of taste, that they became the stock subjects of public satire. In Foote's comedy of "Taste" is an account of the methods which were resorted to in order to palm off on unsuspecting purchasers the vilest daubs and the most hideous statues. This picture, though grossly exaggerated, is yet quite as true at bottom as that given of knaves of a different class in Ben Jonson's "Alchemyst." Lord Dupe goes to a picture auction. He asks—

"What pictures are those, Mr. Canto?

Canto. They are not in the sale: but I fancy I could procure them for your lordship.

Lord Dupe. This, I presume, might have been a landskip? But the water, and the men, and the trees, and the dogs, and the ducks, and the pigs, they are all obliterated—all gone.

Brush. An indisputable mark of its antiquity, its very merit; besides, a little varnish will fetch the figures again.

Lord Dupe. Set it down for me."

So much for painting: let us see how sculpture fared.

"*Canto.* Bring forward the head from Herculaneum. Now, gentlemen, here is a jewel.

All. Ay, ay, let's see.

Canto. 'Tis not entire, tho'.

Novice. So much the better.

Canto. Right, sir; the very mutilations of this piece are worth all the most perfect performances of modern artists. Now, gentlemen, here's a touchstone for your taste.

All. Great! great indeed!

Novice. Great! Amazing! Divine! Oh let me embrace the dear dismembered bust! A little farther off. I'm ravished! I'm transported! What an attitude! But then the locks! How I adore the simplicity of the antients! How unlike the present priggish, prickeared puppets! How gracefully they fall all adown the cheek! So decent and so grave, and — who the devil do you think it is, Brush? Is it a man or a woman?

Canto. The connoisseurs differ. Some will have it to be the Jupiter Tonans of Phidias, and others the Venus of Paphos from Praxiteles; but I don't think it fierce enough for the first, nor handsome enough for the last.

Novice. Yes, handsome enough.

All. Very handsome; handsome enough.

Canto. Not quite; therefore I am inclined to join with Signor Julio de Pampedillo, who, in a treatise dedicated to the King of the Two Sicilies, calls it the Serapis of the Egyptians, and supposes it to have been fabricated about eleven hundred and three years before the Mosaic account of the Creation.

Novice. Prodigious! and I dare swear true.

All. Oh! true—very true.

Puff. Upon my honour, 'tis a very fine bust; but where is the nose?

Novice. The nose! What care I for the nose? Where is the nose? Why, sir, if it had a nose, I would not give sixpence for it. How the devil should we distinguish the works of the antients if they were perfect? The nose, indeed!"

The careful criticism of men who have studied their subjects, and who freely state the grounds of their decisions, has happily replaced the narrow-minded objections and the injudicious praise of connoisseurs, whose chief object it was to maintain a character for intuitive knowledge and unerring judgment. It could not be otherwise. This generation has become intolerant of the tranquil satisfaction displayed by the last with truths it called established, and which we regard as conventionalities. Dogmas in literature, theology, or art, are unwelcome to us. To re-think and re-state problems which the timid regard as solved is now the fit employment of the intelligent and courageous. The solutions which seemed complete to the man of the eighteenth century, not only appear imperfect to us, but we cannot possibly deem them adequate. No man can fairly accept a conclusion which he has not thought out for himself. Truths are not inherited like money or land. They must be created afresh by every one, otherwise they are not living forces which direct, but inanimate fetters which impede his progress. The man who repeats as certain that which he has been taught, instead of what his independent judgment has led him to hold, is, in another way, repeating set phrases which do not express his meaning, instead of casting words into forms which reproduce his thoughts. A man or a generation may act like a parrot: happily for us the age in which we live is not satisfied with filling so ignoble a part. We have resolved to look at things from the point of view of the nineteenth century and to state without reticence what appearance they present. Should there ensue a flux and reflux of opinions; should the old landmarks be removed, we shall neither lament nor pause. Without motion there can be no life.

That the supremacy of great names should be disputed, that traditionary opinions should be exploded, new canons of criticism laid down, new models of excellence discovered, are results which ought to be desired by all who think that man is something better than a vegetable, and progress something more than an empty word.

Imbued with the determination to upset all opinions with respect to art which had conventionality for their basis, Mr. Ruskin began his career as a critic. He has proved himself as accomplished and uncompromising an agitator in the world of art as Mr. Bright in the world of politics. Not only did he set the example of free criticism, but he cast discredit on technicalities which served to make of art a mystery intelligible to the initiated alone, and not always to them. To abolish is far more easy

than to reconstruct: an iconoclast makes a bad high-priest. So long as he confined himself to exposing the folly of antiquated traditions, Mr. Ruskin was triumphant and esteemed. When he offered himself as a guide, he obtained plenty of followers, who soon had cause to regret their blind trust in a leader who neither knew the route nor his own mind. Indeed, his mental organization is so peculiar, that what others find impossible even to conceive he can perform with the greatest coolness. It is not given to other men to feel certain that black is at the same time white; that to follow alternately opposite paths is always to proceed in the same direction; that to give forth contradictory opinions is to be uniformly consistent.

Between Mr. Ruskin as the acute critic and as the arbiter of taste, there is the same difference as there is between the leveller and the legislator. When he devoted his natural and acquired powers to art-criticism, he rendered a service it is impossible to overrate. When he proceeded to promulgate art-dogmas, he incurred the pity of those who were his truest friends. He has merited in nearly equal measure both our thanks and our censure. Our thanks are due to him not so much for what he has taught us, but for having made us think. We condemn him for arrogantly dictating the precepts we ought to observe and the kind of works we ought alone to admire, and for inculcating that a work must be great if he can find no fault with it. His failings are exemplified by this; that the first duty of his successor will be to preach the doctrine of toleration, and to proclaim that in all questions relating to art he alone acts wisely who brings to their solution his enlightened private judgment.

To provide an explanation of the problems which perplex all who concern themselves with art is the aim of M. Taine. He offers us a method whereby we may decide as to the excellences of any school of painting, sculpture, or architecture. According to him a painting is not necessarily bad because it was produced by a Dutchman, or valuable because it was produced by an Italian. He does not denounce what he cannot admire. Unlike Mr. Ruskin, he does not teach us that a Dutchman who "libelled the sea," or an Italian who misrepresented natural scenery, is a man who deserves to be branded with every opprobrious epithet in this world, and punished still more severely in the next. M. Taine regards pictures as facts it behoves us to explain, instead of toys to be quarrelled over, treasured with care or tossed aside in disgust. He thinks, moreover, that all the arts are mental products subject to similar laws, and to be explained on similar principles. In short, the system he has already applied to works of literature, he now applies to the explanation of works of art. That system we have several times discussed;* yet we must do so again both in order to state our objections to certain parts of it, and also that the exposition of M. Taine's recent works may be rendered intelligible to our readers. But we feel bound for another reason to recur to a consideration of the system which, if he did not originate, M. Taine has at least put to a practical use. When we first considered it, we did so as something which was new, but not proved by long experience to possess substantial value. It is now established, although not yet generally accepted. With a perseverance which deserves recognition, its founder has never ceased to uphold its advantages, and to illustrate them by his practice. Thus it is forced upon our notice. As briefly as possible we shall state in what it consists, and wherein it is valuable or the reverse. If to do so be accounted as harping too often on the same string, we shall reply that it is better to be chargeable with being wearisome than with disinclination to do justice to what does not flatter our prejudices, or accord with our habits of thought.

Suppose, then, a critic is called upon to determine the merits of a school of painting, a class of books, or a style of architecture, what course does he take? He either compares the picture, the work, or the building, with that by some one who is dignified with the title of master or classic, and pronounces it good or bad in proportion as it resembles or differs from the model; or else he states dogmatically that the picture or book is valuable or the reverse because he likes or dislikes it. We have an example of this in the critiques by Addison and Macaulay on "Paradise Lost." Looking alternately at the dicta of Aristotle and the verses of Milton, Addison found so close a correspondence between the philosopher's requirements and the poet's performance that he was able to proclaim Milton's epic worthy of the highest rank. Macaulay, who doubtless was acquainted with "Paradise Lost" from early boyhood, and who certainly knew it by heart, applied to it no minute criticism of details when expressing his opinion. The imagery, the versification, the diction appeared to him alike splendid. The strains of the poet caused his being to thrill with delight, and as a critic he merely tried to find words wherein to convey to others the impression made on himself. In the one case criticism is apt to degenerate into carping: in the other into unmeasured eulogy. The problem is, how to exclude the critic's personality from his decisions. Is it possible to decide as to the merits of a performance otherwise than by stating that which, when analysed, simply means either this is good "because it comes up to a certain standard," or, this is good "because it pleases me?" In other words, is it possible for criticism to be not a matter of opinion, but of demonstration; an art which, when practised, will render products varying in kind and quality, or a science of which the conclusions must be at once uniform and indisputable?

M. Taine not only believes in the practicability of depriving criticism of personality, but also of imparting to it all the elements of certainty which induce us to assent to the truth of a demonstration of Euclid. The works of an author or the literature of a nation being the subject of M. Taine's criticism, what does he do? Not satisfied with perusing the books

* See the *Westminster Review* for July 1861, April 1864, and January 1865.

merely, he inquires first, where was the author born, who were his progenitors, what were the fixed ideas of his race? His next inquiry is as to the circumstances under which he was reared, what was the place he occupied in society, to what influences was he exposed, in what manner did the spirit of the times affect him? Finally, he examines the peculiarities of the epoch during which the author's works were produced, what were its tendencies, how were they manifested?

These inquiries are supposed to have for result the discerning of the motive-spring of the author's mind, the spring which actuates his faculties, causing them to operate with uniform motion, and giving rise to a definite issue. We have shown in what manner the works of Milton were criticised by Addison and Macaulay: let us now show how M. Taine applies his method to "Paradise Lost." His first step is to discover and state the dominant characteristic of Milton, which is "the sentiment of the sublime," and then to prove by examples how this is displayed in his life and his writings. He compares him as a poet with Shakespeare, and notes the difference between them as consisting in Milton being a poet of reason, and Shakespeare of impulse. It is then shown how on these grounds Milton's minor poems and prose works are admirable, while his greatest is an "imperfect but sublime" poem; that it is a mass of reasoning diversified with fine pictures; that its chief personages are reproductions of the men of the time, instead of being creations having the stamp of their primitive origin; that both God and man are transformed into orthodox and common-place persons, and that the poet's genius is only displayed when he depicts huge monsters, gorgeous pieces of scenery, and speaks by the mouth of Satan in the tones of a stern Republican.*

Now, the difference between the methods of procedure of Addison, of Macaulay, and of M. Taine is but one of degree. Having found that the "Paradise Lost" fulfilled the conditions which Aristotle had laid down, Addison felt himself at liberty to give free scope to his personal feelings. He acted like a physician of the last century, who insisted that every man attacked with illness had at one time suffered from a common cutaneous disease. Unless the patient would confess this, he refused to prescribe for him; but the avowal once made, the physician treated the case on its merits. Macaulay rated his own judgment higher than that of any other person, whether ancient or modern. It was sufficient for him that he liked or disliked a poem to praise it in fulsome terms or condemn it with every epithet and phrase of contempt. M. Taine really acts after a similar fashion. The system, according to which he tests and distinguishes that which is meritorious from that which is unworthy of notice, is chiefly a personal one. In the hands of any one possessing the like power of analysis, a taste equally refined, a judgment as sure, a knowledge as vast, and a style as fresh and effective, his method might be made to yield diametrically opposite conclusions. Were his system as perfect as he maintains, it would produce the like results in the hands of others than himself. Napoleon laid down certain rules which he thought essential to ensure success on the field of battle. No one knows them better than his nephew, yet who can believe that having these rules graven in his memory, his nephew, if placed in similar circumstances, would gain such victories as Jena and Austerlitz!

Not merely do we dispute M. Taine's success, but we question the possibility of his accomplishing his end. He would dissect our faculties as a surgeon does our bodies. He would point out the governing faculty in the mind, as the surgeon would the muscle which actuates a member. The radical difference between the two is, that the critic has to assume that which the operator can show. If we grant that the ruling tendency of Milton was "the sentiment of the sublime," we cannot ignore the consequences which may be made to flow from this. But in science we will grant nothing. If criticism is to be raised to a science, it must be on the same terms as anatomy has become a science. Every fact met with must be treated by itself, and demonstration must go hand in hand with deduction. When asked to consider the influence of race on a man, we must have it proved that the race in question really displays the exact characteristics of any one writer, painter, or sculptor. It is not enough, in a scientific statement, to speak of a Latin or an Anglo-Saxon race; we must have the race defined with a precision which is almost impossible, seeing that Latin or Anglo-Saxon is but an epithet.

Thus it is that we cannot admit the critical conclusions of M. Taine to be equal to demonstrations. So far as his system professes to be scientific, we disown it. But in denying the truth of what has not been brought home to us, we do not mean to disparage either the method or its results. As a means of stating and illustrating a critical dictum we rank it very high, for its chief object is to group facts in order to show how, on a particular supposition, an author or an artist has exercised his talents. We think this a step in advance of the old method, which resolved itself into expressing not only a personal, but also an unreasoned opinion. The final result we hold to be similar in both cases, and regard the maxims which M. Taine would have us accept as proven to be only his personal opinions embodied in set formula. If we accept or admire these opinions, it is because of the confidence we place in the critic's judgment, and the respect we pay to his talents. To introduce a new method of criticism may not be so great an achievement as to render critical conclusions impregnable as the demonstration of one of Euclid's propositions. We judge men, however, by their successes rather than their failures. This substantial merit is so great, that we think nothing of M. Taine's shortcomings, any more than we should despise the alchemists

* See the *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise*, vol. 2, p. 328 to p. 434.

because they failed to transmute lead into gold, forgetting altogether that they founded modern chemistry.

In his "Philosophy of Art," he starts with these propositions: first, that every work of art bears the impress of its author, so clearly, that a competent judge will be able to discern the very period of his career at which it was produced; second, that both the work and the artist belong to a group of contemporary works, all having a certain resemblance to each other; and third, that a school of art is encircled by a public having special tastes and peculiarities which distinguish it from the people of any other age. In order, then, to comprehend a work of art, the life of any artist, or of a school, it is necessary to understand what was the general state of society, the manners in vogue, the ideas that were popular at the time when the work was executed, and during which the artist lived. By following this course it is possible to compose a philosophy of the fine arts, not as others have done by dogmatizing, but by an exposition of facts, and designed not to lay down precepts but to indicate laws. Hitherto, but two precepts have been discovered which are beyond dispute, and with which a professor or philosopher has no concern. The first is, "Be born with genius," the second, "Learn your profession and work hard."

"What is art, and wherein consists its nature?" A question like this can be answered only by adducing facts. Now, all the five principal arts, poetry, sculpture, painting, architecture, and music, have this in common, that the object of those who practise them is to produce an imitation. If we object to a statue, we tell the sculptor that no real legs or arms could ever resemble those he has fashioned. To a painter we say that the perspective is bad, his colouring unbearable, because the opposite of what we see in nature. Another proof of this is furnished by what occurs to all artists. When young, they work after models, endeavouring to reproduce the very appearance of things, and even doing this with an overwrought minuteness. A time arrives when they fancy that they can learn no more. Then they begin to draw upon their resources. But having ceased to acquire, they fall into mannerism and unreality, substituting their own devices for natural facts, and ending by making of artistic processes a kind of mechanism. When this becomes true of a school, it is on the brink of dissolution.

Literal imitation is not, however, the chief end of art. Were it so, then the maker of casts or of photographs would deserve a place among the greatest artists. An artist who should devote all his energies to producing pictures or portraits having the characteristics of photographs is unworthy of the name. He may reproduce on canvas every spot and wrinkle of the original, and succeed in finishing a portrait so perfectly that it will almost seem to breathe. The spectator marvels, but is unaffected. His eyes have been mocked by a fiction: his mind has not been impressed with the deep and lasting sensation which follows the contemplation of a work of true art. That deceptive imitation is not the object of the artist, is proved even more conclusively by sculpture than by painting. A statue can never be made to represent with fidelity a living original. When this is attempted, as in the images of the saints which fill the churches of Naples and Spain, the effect is revolting. Of imitation there must be a little, but a very little, being limited to the relations and mutual dependence of the several parts; in other words, if the limbs are of a certain size, the body must be in proportion; the angles which are observed in the living model must be reproduced in the copy. A master of his craft will venture to disregard copying altogether. Michael Angelo did this when he composed the group on the tomb of the Medicis at Florence. No such figures as these can be found throughout the length and breadth of Italy. He evolved them from his own mind. He exaggerated, if he did not outrage, natural proportions; but he did this of set purpose, as a means of representing the state of his feelings at the moment. In like manner the "Kermess" of Rubens is a picture of an orgie, and the figures and the company represent both the character of the scene and the impression made on the artist by the unbridled manners of the period which followed the cessation of the wars of religion. When an artist takes liberties like these, it is in order that he may the better body forth the essential portion of his subject and the predominant idea he has formed.

Having premised thus much, M. Taine states what he regards as the true definition of art, which is, "A quality from which all the others, or at least many of them, are deduced in linked sequence." In order to explain this by an illustration, take the case of a country, with its physical peculiarities, its scenery, its agriculture, its animals, cities, and people. If we consider the Netherlands, for example, we shall find them to have been formed by alluvial deposits. This is their essential characteristic. To this circumstance are attributable both the aspect of the country, and the morals and manners of its people. The plains are moist and fertile, owing to the largeness and number of the rivers, and the richness of the deposits of vegetable matter. These plains are always green because they are always well watered. There it is that cattle thrive, that milk is plentiful and butcher's meat low in price. It might be said that in this country the water nourishes the grass which serves for pasture to the cattle which yield cheese, butter, and beef, all of which, combined with beer, compose the people. The climate and the mode of life give to the people their peculiar temperament. The natural formation of the soil has an influence on the architecture, for stone being unknown, bricks and tiles are employed in the construction of houses: rain being common, the roofs are made to slope, and as the humidity is very great and constant, the outer woodwork is varnished. Now, the artist must take all these things into account. What nature has made dominant, he must render predominant. In a true work of art, the essential character of the subject is brought into prominence: that which

would conceal it being left on the one side, that which would alter it being modified or suppressed. Here, then, is a final definition of a work of art. We have first supposed that it consisted in "exact imitation;" then distinguishing between literal and intelligent imitation, we have seen that what it must reproduce is the "relations of parts;" finally, we have found that the latter are to be studied for the purpose of "bringing into prominence an essential characteristic." The whole may be thus summed up: "the end of a work of art is to manifest some essential or salient characteristic, consequently an important idea, more clearly and completely than is done by real objects. This is accomplished by employing a group of linked parts, whereof the relations are systematically modified. In the imitative arts, sculpture, painting, and poetry, these wholes correspond to real objects."

Having set forth the nature of a work of art, M. Taine proceeds to state the law of its formation. This is, that a work of art is fixed by a whole, consisting of the general condition of the surrounding mental influences and the prevailing manners. It is with a work of art as with the seeds of a plant, which, falling upon congenial soil, germinate and take root. If the temperature be suitable the plant grows up, bears fruit, and propagates its species; but let the thermometer fall or rise a few degrees, let the sun shine too powerfully, or the rain descend too seldom, and the plant changes its character, and perhaps its nature. So it is with the seeds of a work of art. They may be implanted in a nation, but may not germinate, or may do so in different ways. In the moral as in the physical world there is a temperature which accords with certain works and kills and transforms others. Thus it is that at one time the artistic products of a people are stamped with idealism, at another with realism; at one time are notable for the perfection of their design, at another for the splendour of their colouring. The spirit of the age, the state of public sentiment, and the manners that prevail, give them an impulse and a limit, smother them altogether, or cause them to flourish after a settled fashion.

In order that all this can occur, there must prevail a certain amount of joy or sorrow, of bondage or freedom, wealth or poverty; a form of religion, a condition of life; in short, a "conjunction of circumstances by which men are kept under control. This state developes in them corresponding needs, special aptitudes, particular sentiments; for instance, physical activity or tendency to meditation, rudeness here, softness there, sometimes the talent of oratory, sometimes a longing for enjoyment, a hundred other infinitely varied and complex dispositions: in Greece that bodily perfection and equilibrium of the faculties which a too intellectual or laborious kind of life cannot injure; in the Middle Ages the intemperance of an overstrained imagination and the delicacy of feminine sensibility; in the seventeenth century a knowledge of the world and the dignity of aristocratic saloons; in modern times the greatness of unbridled rivalries and the malady of unsatiated desires." Amid this group of sentiments stands conspicuous the typical personage of the time. In Greece this was the nude figure of the youth sprung from a fine race and expert in every physical exercise; in the Middle Ages it was the ascetic monk or the knight-errant; in the seventeenth century it was the courtier; in our day it is Faust or Werther. The several conditions and their results form four terms of a series. First, there is a condition which gives rise to distinct tendencies and faculties; second, a typical personage constituted by the predominancy of these faculties or tendencies; third, either sounds, forms, colours, or words, by means of which this personage is brought into view; or, fourth, which accord with the tendencies and faculties of which he is composed.

Taken as a whole, the foregoing system meets with our approval. It contrasts most favourably with those of preceding writers on the same subject, and notably with that which was enunciated with great pomp by M. Cousin, and which had such a striking though temporary success. Were it for no other reason than that all systems of æsthetics have been provisional because dogmatic and therefore incomplete, this one, wherein facts obtain precedence over dogmas, would command our attention and deserve our approval. But we are pleased with it for the more important reason that it reconciles many contending opinions, and prepares the way, not for solving vexed problems, but for proving that they are alike insoluble and unimportant. Philosophers have wearied themselves in propounding answers to the question, "What is beauty?" They have told us in turn that it is an "idea," an "essence," a "force;" that it is produced by "unity in variety," or has its origin in association. The supporters of the notion that beauty is inherent in objects, when met with the question: Why, then, if the Venus de Medicis be taken as the type of the beautiful, should any one be charmed with the Hottentot Venus? To this the answer is, that whoever does not admit the superiority of the former over the latter ought to do so. Then the upholders of the theory of association step in and tell us that no one can admire anything unless the sight of it suggests pleasurable reminiscences, or unless he has been habituated to the spectacle. M. Taine gives up the attempt of proving either the existence or non-existence of that which is alike intangible and incomprehensible. He would not set the gross and very robust women of Rubens in contrast with the graceful and delicate damsels of Raphael, and denounce the former as ugly and go into raptures over the latter. He does not think it a moral duty to characterize as necessarily odious whatever shocks him. On the contrary, he permits others to indulge their tastes, confining himself to noting and examining them, inquiring whence they are derived, stating why they are displayed. If the work of a painter faithfully convey an aspect of natural appearances without being a mechanical copy destitute of imagination, M. Taine would be satisfied. If the work were, in addition to

its representative quality, one marked by excellence in execution, he would call it superior to another work from which the latter characteristic was absent. What he would do before the work of the artist, he would do in the presence of nature. As a natural production, he would find nothing to condemn in the Hottentot Venus, although he might personally prefer the Venus de Medicis. In short, he would confine himself to register facts and deduce inferences from them. His philosophical theories merit our praise whenever they are based on investigation rather than on assumption. They are on a par with preceding theories when treating opinions as facts.

The following is among the weakest points in his system. He maintains that in every age there is a reigning personage in whom is embodied, as it were, the spirit of the time; that in Greece this was the nude and physically perfect youth; in the Middle Ages the ecstatic monk and the amorous knight; in the seventeenth century the accomplished courtier; in our day, the unsatiated and melancholy Faust or Werther. He maintains, moreover, that this personage gives a special tone to the art of the age.

That in Greece the athlete was held in honour and supplied a fine subject for the sculptor, is unquestionable. But statuary was not the only art which was carried to unexampled perfection in Greece. Poetry, oratory, and architecture there held as high a rank, and have been as much extolled by posterity as the statues which were modelled in order to deify the human frame. Concerning the Middle Ages, we should hesitate as much to conclude that their spirit was truly indicated by the ascetic monk and amorous knight as that they ought to be stigmatized as dark. We do not gather from Chaucer that in England the monks as a class were notable for the austerity of their lives. We are inclined to think that in those times life was very much the same as now, but with this difference, that there then prevailed grosser superstitions than are current in these days even among the ignorant. That the accomplished courtier may be taken as the typical personage of the seventeenth century in France, we shall not deny; but we should dispute the application of the same rule to England, as much as we question the assertion that at the present time the reigning hero is Faust or Werther.

In order to defend the side we have taken, it is necessary to settle another question which really lies at the root of the difference. This is, are there no exceptions to the rule that men are moulded by circumstances and reflect the ideas in vogue? Is the individual wholly destitute of personal influence on his times? If he be dependent on impressions received from without for the force and form imparted to the ideas he gives forth, then we must admit the necessity for some governing power to impress on him a special tendency. But if he be self-contained, and capable of using in a fashion peculiar to himself the ideas current among his fellows, then we must recognise in him a leader among men, a prince of his age.

Such a man we hail as a genius. Placed in even worse conditions than other men, he triumphs over difficulties and rises to the top, displacing those who had been accepted as chiefs, and making his authority felt not over his own age only, but through all time. M. Taine affirms that "men can comprehend those sentiments only which chime with their own. Other sentiments, no matter how well expressed, are powerless to move them; the eyes see, but the heart being dead, the eyes are instantly averted" (p. 94). In opposition to this, we cite the dictum of Coleridge, which Wordsworth quoted with approval, "Every great and original writer, in proportion as he is great or original, must himself create the taste by which he is to be relished; he must teach the art by which he is to be seen." There can be few better illustrations of this than the case of Wordsworth. His earliest poems were received with indifference by the public, and excited the derision of the critics. Appearing in the double capacity of poet and teacher, he was certain to make enemies; for the hatred of schoolboys to instruction is as nothing when compared with the detestation which educated men display towards those who are bold enough to set up as their instructors. Opposed though he was to the prevailing temper of the age, Wordsworth gradually obtained a hearing. A few were thrilled by his verses. They made known what they had experienced, and induced others to read with care what they had been wont to mock through ignorance. In the end the genius of the poet made its influence felt. His works became classics.

The case of Rousseau tells as strongly in our favour. If ever there was a man whose individuality was rendered conspicuous, and who owed what impression he made to the force of his personal qualities, assuredly that writer was Rousseau. He was a true moulder of opinion. That he should have accomplished so much cannot, we think, be adequately explained by the hypothesis that he represented in any particular the dominant spirit of the time. His paradoxes were first received with a smile, and afterwards accepted as truths. Much of the effect he produced is attributable to the boldness of his assumptions and the finish of his style. He wrote in such a manner that men were almost compelled to hearken. His writings produced such an effect that the current of popular feeling was turned into a new channel, and he who had begun by being scorned as a fool ended by being venerated as an apostle.

We might multiply examples, adding to those already cited the cases of Dante, of Cervantes, of Shakespeare, of Reynolds, and of Turner; but we prefer to strengthen our argument by making an important distinction. There is a class of men who are thoroughly imbued with the sentiments of their age, and on whom the prevailing opinion works with an irresistible force. They are the men of talent. It is their chief merit to act as living mirrors. They cannot master ideas, but patiently resign themselves to be mastered by them. In one respect they are more powerful than the originator of new ideas, for they form the vast majority. Multiplied by numbers their influence is great. Feeling certain that unless they make themselves heard they will

neither gain a position nor retain it, they are always ready to exaggerate. To them ridicule is more welcome than indifference, for if they do not attract attention, they have a foretaste of the oblivion which they always fear will be their fate. Such men composed the crowd of minor dramatists that surrounded Shakespeare. Their plays were sometimes excellent, but they were unequal. They can still be relished by the student, because of the occasional beauties contained in them. But to the master mind is rightly reserved the honour of being read and enjoyed by all. What Shakespeare gained from his own age was trifling compared with what he bestowed upon every succeeding one. The spirit of the time may have operated to produce a "Dr. Faustus," but something else was necessary in order to create a play so fantastic as "A Midsummer Night's Dream," a man so human yet so unreal, so true to nature yet without a prototype, as "Hamlet."

What that something is we know as a manifestation, not in its essence. We call it genius, and regard it as a phenomenon of which the law has not yet been discovered. Looking upon it as the result of physical organization, we are anxious to learn the conditions requisite for its development and display. He who is born with genius can evolve from the ideas acquired by and imparted to all in early life, products both new and original. To take a physical illustration: the man of genius resembles an improved boiler which, with one-half the usual quantity of fuel not only produces twice as much steam as any other, but also produces steam which acts as a motive-power, even after the fire is extinguished. The influence of a man of talent is at best but temporary, and generally dies with him. The influence of a man of genius is everywhere acknowledged, and is perpetual in duration. What had the spirit of the age to do with causing Schiller, when a schoolboy and sequestered from the world, to compose the "Robbers," and thereby make his own reputation and a revolution in German literature? Or how could it have caused Goethe, at an age when other youths think only of play, to invent a religion, and Pascal to discover the methods of geometry? Until sufficient reasons be given for these and cognate phenomena, we shall maintain that the generalizations of M. Taine are more sweeping than the facts warrant.

Every one whose mind is garnered with ancient and modern learning, and who delights in verifying by personal observation the fascinating stories he has read, must regard Italy as a fairy land, and must long to visit it. It was natural, then, that M. Taine should have been prompted to proceed thither; he went, however, not as one who travels merely for pleasure, but as an inquirer, who, while seeking to gratify his curiosity, desires when he gains fresh knowledge, to get rid of old errors. He has now given to the public a faithful transcript of the impressions made on his mind during a sojourn in Naples and Rome. Even were its intrinsic worth far less than it is, we should still welcome this volume on account of the spirit which animated its author. He is as fresh as he is earnest. Moreover, he differs from the ruck of travellers over beaten tracks and who compile "Scampers," or "Wanderings," or "Jottings by the Way," as much as the framers of quack advertisements differ from the authors of honest reviews. In order to pen such advertisements it is only necessary to be thoroughly unscrupulous, to have an imperfect acquaintance with any language, and a large stock of sonorous and meaningless words. In order to compile an ordinary book of travels, the indispensable requisites are to be destitute of critical acumen, to be puffed up with vanity, to be skilled in quoting appositely with the aid of a dictionary of classical quotations, and to have a great capacity for recording imaginary grievances. Ordinary books of travel are placed on a par by competent critics with a sheet of quack advertisements. They are worth more in a pecuniary sense, because the paper weighs heavier.

Indeed, to travel so as to learn anything worth repeating implies the possession of qualifications with which very few are gifted at birth, or have the capacity for acquiring. The faculty of observation must be keen, the sensitiveness to impressions must be great; the mind must be unhampered with prejudices, and the judgment must be sober and comprehensive. Equally necessary is it to have a thorough knowledge of history and of literature, so as to be able to distinguish fable from fact, and to be proof against imposture. It would be too strong an assertion to say that all guides tell falsehoods; but it would be an equally rash act to take any of their statements upon trust. How many travellers are there who have the discernment requisite in such a case! How many go through museums noting down particulars as absurd as the fictitious details which Beckford wrote concerning remarkable painters, and which the housekeeper whom they were intended to deceive afterwards retailed with the gravity of one who looked for a fee! The late Lord Macaulay once went on a journey through France for the purpose of visiting the chief spots of historical interest. He found it impossible to gain any assistance from the guides, and even forced them to confess that they could be of no use to him. No sooner did they begin their stories than he caught them tripping in dates and facts; and when he poured forth question after question with his usual fluency, they first stared at him in amazement and then left him in dismay.

At the outset, M. Taine announces the kind of account he means to give, and the manner in which he has prepared himself for his undertaking. What he professes to furnish is his journal, with many pages omitted. He takes no note of those commonplace incidents which are thought so important by ordinary travellers, the quality of their dinners, the comfort of their beds. He avows his preference for natural scenery over artistic works, and for the natural over the artificial in art. In his opinion, "provided an artist entertains a profound and impassioned sentiment, and thinks only about expressing it completely, exactly as it is, without hesitation, stumbling, or reserve, it is good; when the artist is sincere and sufficiently master of his means to translate literally and entirely his impression,

his work is beautiful, whether it be ancient or modern, Gothic or classic." He avows his main object is to strive and enter into the spirit of the times wherein were produced the works he criticises, to regard things from the point of view of the artist, and thus estimate them with justice.

Although the works of art in Italy received the largest share of M. Taine's notice, yet the condition of its inhabitants and their political prospects were not overlooked by him. His first thought on landing was directed to the appearance presented by the people, and his conclusion was that they were evidently sprung from another race than his fellow-countrymen. The streets of Civita Vecchia were filthy, and its population was poverty stricken; still these drawbacks did not prevent the element of race manifesting itself with effect. Many noble figures were to be seen in the streets: some were even beautiful, nearly all gesticulated like actors, and displayed wonderful ease in assuming grotesque attitudes. Compared with the French who had landed, they seemed to have sprung from a finer and less vigorous race. But they are indolent; to walk about and enjoy themselves constitutes their happiness. Nature has done so much for them that they are almost spared the necessity of doing anything for themselves. It is the same at Rome. The streets are encumbered with squalid figures basking in the sun, and the windows are filled with gaily-dressed women gazing at the passers-by. All are remarkably quiet, and those who play do so as if amusement were a trouble. Seeing Saint Peter's for the first time, M. Taine was disappointed. He disliked its composite style of architecture, which he considered unfitted for a church. In his opinion those who built Saint Peter's were nothing but pagans afraid of damnation. "That which is sublime in religion, tender outpouring before a merciful Saviour, the terror of conscience before a just Judge, the Hebrew's lyrical and manly enthusiasm before the face of an avenging God, the expansion of the free Grecian nature before natural and smiling beauty, in all these sentiments they were deficient. They fasted on Friday and painted a saint in order to secure his good offices. Michael Angelo, as a recompense, received from the Pope I know not how many indulgences, on condition of making the round of the seven basilicas of Rome on horseback. They had strong passions, unbroken energy, they have attained grandeur because they issued from a great epoch, but true religious feeling they had not. They renovated old paganism, but a second growth is never worth the first. Grovelling superstition, narrow devotion, quickly came to deform and wither the strong primitive inspiration." "In fine, Saint Peter's is but a hall for display—the largest and finest in the world, whereby a great institution flaunts its power. It is not the church of a religion, but the church of a cult."

The like impression was made by the churches of Naples. Santa-Maria della Pietra, for example, is pronounced to be a "gaudy sweetmeat-box:" it contains a veiled statue of Modesty; but so thin is the veil, so clinging, so puffed out by the breast and the naked parts of the body, that the statue is more than naked. Here paganism is merely varnished with Christianity. The covering is ascetic, but the body is sensual. In place of grandeur is found affectation. These churches are the repositories of fine ornaments, affording the same delight as the contents of a jeweller's shop.

However, if the interior of the churches disappointed M. Taine, the external scenery afforded him unspeakable gratification. To the beauties of external nature he is most sensitive, and the contrast between the balmy and clear air, the blue and calm sea of the Mediterranean, and the dull atmosphere and stormy surface of the Atlantic seen from the coast of his native land, at this season, impressed him as much by its strangeness as it charmed him by its beauty. Here he could imagine with distinctness the notions of life which were entertained by the ancients. He could feel with vividness how precious it was to pass the time in an unconcerned attitude, and calmly to meet death as an end rather than a change. For the ancients, to die was to pass from day to twilight. But like other Southern cities, Naples had a drawback which he could not ignore, and could with difficulty endure. Like all visitors, he felt himself disposed to hold his nose when beholding the most attractive sights. It is said that the natives of the South have finer senses than the natives of the North, but he would limit that claim to their senses of seeing and hearing. We entirely agree with him.

As it is impossible to follow M. Taine step by step, we must pass over his criticism on much that he saw, and give a summary of the more important things he heard. At the present moment most people are more anxious to be informed of the ideas which influence Italians than to have their attention directed to Italian antiquities. Hence the experience of every competent inquirer deserves our earnest attention. Although less strongly disposed to take a side in politics than to pronounce an opinion on a work of art or literature, yet M. Taine's sympathies are evidently liberal, and his political opinions are those of the noble Party of Progress. According to him the Neapolitans are now in a condition similar to that of the French Republicans of 1790. They are given to express strong hopes in inflated language. They are ready to welcome still greater changes than have yet been even proposed. A foreign war would not be displeasing to them, insomuch as they hold that it would consolidate their position, and cause minor differences to be buried and forgotten.

From a middleman who purchased the cotton of the peasants in order to re-sell it to English merchants, he learned that since the expulsion of the Bourbons the peasantry in the environs of Naples have become industrious as well as free. Commerce used to be virtually prohibited by being hampered with conditions it was hardly possible to fulfil. The people were allowed to eat, drink, and amuse themselves discreetly, but they were hindered from acquiring knowledge by reading, and experience by travelling. They were constantly afraid of be-

ing denounced as disloyal, and thrown into prison, there to linger without hope of escape. Now that the peasantry feel certain of gaining something by their toil, and can follow their own course without dread of painful consequences, they work with unexampled assiduity. Still ignorant and superstitious, they are not over hostile to the brigands. Besides, were they to incur the wrath of these robbers, on them would fall a punishment equivalent to their ruin. By the middle class the priests are now regarded as the authors of every evil. Indeed, there are Jacobites in Italy, as there were in France after the first Revolution. In the former country it is as necessary for some external force to keep in check the elements of dissatisfaction and disorder, as in the latter a foreign invasion proved requisite to rally the majority around the standard of freedom. Dread of attack from abroad entertained for several years to come will be the making of Southern Italy.

The greatest difficulty which the Government has to face is the large number of sinecurists who have been dispossessed of their incomes. In 1791 the same hardships were undergone by the members of the king's, the queen's, and the dauphin's household in France. The Revolution deprived them at once of their posts and their pay. The Neapolitans who have been thrown upon the world are naturally discontented, and are heart and soul adverse to the new order of things. With equal reason, the priests are the enemies of the present Government. They have lost alike their influence and their position. What power they retain is over the women, through whom they labour to undo what has been accomplished, and through whose agency they succeed in causing much serious annoyance. The most favourable symptom is the capacity of the people for learning, and the desire they manifest to be instructed. The knowledge in demand is not of a superficial kind; the philosophy of Hegel is taught in the university, and one professor labours to prove that Gioberti is an Italian Hegel. In short, no people could be better fitted for taking a high place among the cultivated nations of the world. The present form of government may be distasteful to them, but it deserves our approbation, for its delight is to open schools instead of following the example of the government that preceded it and imprisoning all who are enlightened.

Returning to Rome for the purpose of studying its contents, M. Taine likens it to the studio of an artist who once was famous, and who is now tormented with creditors, who have seized his property in order to reimburse themselves. Many things of value have been taken away, but many of great beauty are left behind. What remains is exhibited to strangers in order to gain a living. Rome is a place to visit, but not one in which to remain. Passing over what is said about the antique works of art, we shall note the criticisms made upon the works of Raphael and Michael Angelo.

On entering the Vatican, the first picture which attracts the visitor is the "Battle of Constantine," which Raphael designed, and Julio Romano painted; then he passes along a glazed passage, where are to be seen vague traces of Raphael's arabesques; then bending back is perceived his famous "Loggia." After that are traversed the four celebrated chambers which the artist decorated. Having seen all these things, nineteen out of every twenty visitors feel disappointed, and exclaim, "Is that all?" These frescoes are like the imperfect texts of the works of Sophocles or Homer: present a thirteenth century manuscript to an ordinary reader in the hope that he will be able to decipher it, and you will find that if he speak his mind he will ask in preference for one of Dickens' novels or Heine's songs. M. Taine confesses that, after the first inspection, he had learned he did not understand the works of Raphael, that he would require to study them repeatedly before he could give an opinion regarding their merits, and that what struck him unfavourably was that the figures "posed." A second inspection of the frescoes, especially of the "Burning of Borgo," confirmed him in his opinion as to the artificial character of the work. The fire does not seem terrible. The personages do not seem excited. Conspicuous among the figures is a young man hanging by two arms, and practising gymnastics. A father on tip-toe receives his child handed down by its mother from the top of a wall; neither appear more affected than if a basket of vegetables were passing from hand to hand. Indeed, the whole affair gives the impression of having been produced as an architectural finish. And why should not these frescoes be so regarded? Were not they so intended by Raphael? If so, it is needful to forget our modern ideas, and become permeated with those of the artist in order to judge his productions.

A modern picture is complete in itself, tells its own story, may be hung in any room. Thus it is a very different thing from a painting made for the express purpose of ornamenting a room and completing the architect's design. The painting of former times was not only executed with these objects in view, but it was also regarded with eyes very different from ours. Our heads are filled with ideas, and vacant of images: we call upon an artist to convey to us sentiments through the medium of forms and colours. Three centuries ago it was otherwise. The spectator did not look for tokens of the inner life; he was satisfied if there were placed before him a nude human form, a beautiful animal. To render the nude was the real aim of Italian painting; "the rest is but preparation, development, variety, alteration, or decline." What we read in Vasari confirms the opinion that all of these painters strove to manifest some aspect or characteristic of the human frame, either covered or naked. Raphael first passed several years in the studio of Perugino, a maker of saints, studying the setting of an arm, the fold of a robe, the form of a peaceful and resigned figure, and then went to Florence, where he beheld in the life of action and passion which there prevailed, human bodies in free and natural attitudes. The result of his training was that he thought in forms as we think in phrases.

His life was a happy one. He was exempted from the struggles which usually embitter an artist's career. From the first, his merit was recognised and his position secure. Genial in temperament and universally beloved, he had no shadow in his life. Unlike the majority of painters, his conceptions were put into shape without the smallest difficulty, and to produce was as easy and natural for him as for a tree to put forth blossoms and yield fruit. "He was no struggler, like Michael Angelo, no voluptuary, like his fellows; but a charming dreamer, who came forth at the right moment for designing human forms." In his sketch of the "Marriage of Alexander and Roxana," and his "Judgment of Paris," are figures of goddesses so perfect in outline, in attitude, and in the tranquillity of their bearing, that we can well believe them to be immortals. When gazing upon them, "it seems as if eighteen centuries had been blotted out from history, that the Middle Ages were but a hideous dream, and that after the lapse of several years of meagre or sad tales, mankind had awakened with a start in the age of Sophocles or Phidias."

Returning to the Vatican, and looking at the frescoes which formerly gave him so little pleasure, M. Taine was deeply impressed with them. He says that, having attained the right point of view, what before appeared cold or artificial, now afforded him extreme delight. He perceived that to body forth the human form was the artist's chief object, and that to effect this perfectly, he made other things subordinate to it.

The calm and softness of Raphael's pictures is especially notable: he paints his personages as if he loved them. This is very perceptible in his "School of Athens." "The groups on that staircase neither have existed nor could they exist, and it is precisely on that account they are so beautiful. The scene is laid in a higher world, which mortal eyes have never beheld, and was projected as a whole from the artist's mind." When standing before such a work, we seem to be contemplating that to which the artist has said what Faust desired to say to the moment in which he should enjoy the fruition of his dreams, "Stand still for ever; this is perfection." Among artists there is none who so closely resembles Raphael as Spenser. After the first perusal many persons consider Spenser quaint or dull; there is a want of reality; then we soar with him into the light, and his personages, who could not exist, are divine."

Michael Angelo differs from Raphael in this important particular: that his works can be understood, relished, without special study. They appeal directly to a modern mind. The explanation is, that Michael Angelo's productions have the impress of a soul struggling towards the realization of something unattainable; that struggles of this sort always produce a result which touches the human heart; for a soul in travail is invariably an object of universal sympathy. His education and his mental tastes led him to delight in the majestic and the impressive. The Old and New Testament and the sermons of Savonarola were his favourite reading. What he produced never came up to what he had planned. He was continually striving and never satisfied. "During sixty years, his works served but to display the heroic combat which, even to the last, went on in his heart."

The "Last Judgment" impressed M. Taine less than the other Biblical subjects of Michael Angelo. He perceived in it the mannerism of the artist, who, when he undertook it, was upwards of sixty years old, and who, like other artists at the same age, either exaggerates or copies what has been done before. Michael Angelo exaggerates; diminishes the trunks, and swells out the muscles; makes all his personages vigorous athletes intent on displaying their powers. Nevertheless, the work is unique, resembling a loud blast of triumph blown by an old warrior. Particular figures and groups are among the greatest of his productions. "The powerful Eve, maternally pressing against her side one of her terrified daughters; the old and formidable Adam, an antediluvian colossus, progenitor of the human species; the bestial and carnivorous heads of demons; the damned one who presses his arm against his face, that he might not see the abyss which is engulfing him; the man in the coils of a serpent, who stands motionless, laughing bitterly and transfixed with horror, like to a statue of stone; above all, the thundering Christ, like the Jupiter in Homer, who in the plains overturns the Trojans and their chariots; at his side, almost hidden beneath his arms, shrinking, frightened, having the gesture of a young girl, the Virgin, so fine and noble; all these conceptions are equal to those on the ceiling. They give life to the whole; we cease to feel the abuse of art, the seeking after effect, the domination of mannerism; we only perceive the discipline of Dante, the friend of Savonarola, the hermit imbued with the threatenings of the Old Testament, the patriot, the hero, the lover of justice, who in his heart mourned for his city, who attended the funeral of Italian liberty, who, amid base characters and degenerate souls, alone surviving and becoming sadder every day, spent nine years upon this huge work, his mind overflowing with the thought of the Supreme Judge, hearing beforehand the thunders of the last day."

The examples we have given convey but a faint notion of the fulness and depth of M. Taine's artistic criticism. We have been obliged to omit all reference to the most interesting portions of his critiques, that is, to the illustrations drawn from the history of contemporary manners of the "moral atmosphere" with which Raphael and Michael Angelo were surrounded. We have also been compelled to pass over unnoticed his criticisms on other artists, as well as his opinions respecting the architecture and antiquities of Rome. What we have said will suffice, however, to convince every thoughtful reader of the independence and originality with which in this volume old problems are restated and solved afresh, and we trust will have the effect of inducing our readers to obtain the volume for themselves, and ponder it with the care and attention it deserves. Before closing it we shall extract the

leading opinions herein expressed regarding the condition of the Pope's subjects and the Pope's government. This will form both a pendant and a contrast to what was said about the political condition of Naples, and will interest many who are unhappily indifferent to art, or who are satisfied to accept on all questions relating to it the second-hand sayings in guide books, or the flippant critiques in newspapers.

M. Taine is candid enough to declare his incompetence for giving an exhaustive account, from personal knowledge, of Roman society; he he assures us, however, that his conclusions have been arrived at after having had fifty or sixty discussions with different classes of the people. We are the more disposed to accept the correctness of his statements, because they are advanced with a modesty which is the surest token of good faith. The first thing which struck him was the small number of native artists in the metropolis of art. The painters are copyists by choice, the sculptors expend their energies in polishing their statues; for they know that rich foreigners appreciate that which shines. It is not wholly the fault of the artists that they are so wanting in originality. They are unable to learn, as they are forbidden to travel, or, if permission be given to them, it is with the hint not to return. A man who has the reputation of being a student is watched by the police, who easily find a pretext for entering his house in order to discover a reason for ordering him to enter at, and not to stir out after sunset. There are plenty of professors at the University, but they are so badly paid, that in order to keep body and soul together they are obliged to embrace a profession. It is noteworthy that the sciences of the Middle Ages are held in honour, while modern science is ignored. The necessary means for teaching the most important part of medicine are considered improper; midwifery being taught through the medium of drawings.

Among the so-called educated class there is plenty of natural talent, but also plenty of selfishness. Very few would risk a coin for Italy; fewer still would jeopardize their lives. They will talk loudly, and allow others to do the work. Self-sacrifice they regard as folly. They smile when they see a Frenchman become excited at the prospect of glory, or for the honour of his country. They are patient, subtle, and insinuating; always aiming at taking an advantage without committing themselves. The state of society is an explanation of their conduct. Favouritism is not avowed only, but is the rule. Those who employ a pretty and accommodating lady to prefer their requests are sure never to be denied. To appear well dressed is a passion which must be gratified at all hazards. A husband does not heed what his wife does so long as she can bring money to the common purse; or if he do open his eyes, it is in order to reap a pecuniary profit. Here, as elsewhere, ignorance is found along with indolence. A girl who can write a note is considered learned. No reproach can be levelled against the morality of unmarried girls, their honour being as precious to them as their lives. Their desire is to get married; their greatest triumph, to hook a husband; after marriage they are ready enough to forget the virtues they once practised. It is doubtful if the Romans really desire to become Italians. Some are of opinion that at the end of a month after the incorporation of Rome with Italy they would detest the Piedmontese, and regret the Ecclesiastical Government, which now permits them to do what they please provided they never meddle with politics. They are semi-savages, who would not readily submit to the restraints of laws impartially administered.

Between the commonalty and the nobility there is not much to choose. As a body the Roman nobles are stupid: Prince Lello, in M. Edmond About's "Tolla" is a fair sample of his class. Many of them have travelled, and have had opportunities for becoming enlightened, but have not profited by them. When they entertain, their guests belong to their immediate circle, and are as much a part of the mansion as the chairs and tables. It is almost impossible for a stranger to acquire their confidence. Their education disposes them to regard even their very neighbours with suspicion. What they really mean they rarely say. The only thing they do with heartiness is to make love. This is not forbidden by the Pope; he only interferes when the consequences become disquieting. Should they possess estates, they must entrust them to agents. The proprietors of those estates are not to be envied. If a farmer fails to pay his rent on the appointed day he asks for three months' grace; then he repeats his request, till at length his landlord's patience is exhausted. It is decided that he must be evicted, but his nephew is a canon, and the governor of the district is induced to pray that the landlord will have pity on his tenant. A year passes, and the sheriff's officer is despatched: he stops short on being told that a cardinal is the delinquent's friend. The consequence is that justice is delayed, that the tenant is afforded renewed opportunities for showing himself to be an honest man, that he takes advantage of those opportunities to harass his landlord so grievously that the latter is forced in the end not only to forego his claim but also to bribe his tenant to give up possession and proceed elsewhere in order to recommence the same game.

At present, politics are the chief topic of conversation in Rome. It is often said that the presence of the French troops has made the Government more tyrannical, and many expect that its fall cannot be long delayed after the withdrawal of the foreign garrison. M. Taine does not think the oppression so cruel as is supposed, and believes that it cannot be compared to that of the Bourbons in Naples, where men were tortured as well as imprisoned. There is nothing surprising in liberal opinions being held in aversion here; an ecclesiastical government must disapprove of that which is contrary to its spirit. One priest may be independent in heart and deed, but several acting together must behave like despots. The Pope is obliged to follow in the course chalked out for him, to uphold the traditions of his

office, and denounce as revolutionary whatever is new. He is at once the assertor and the guardian of the truth: his word is law, but in order to be so regarded it must coincide with the doctrine of the Church. As Church doctrines are all classified and defined, as, indeed, every question, according to the Romish Church, has long since been settled, it is unnecessary to attempt the discovery of new truths, for it is impossible to discover any.

Among the young and well-informed Romans it is thought possible to retain the Papal system while getting rid of its drawbacks, and to reconcile Church dogmas with modern progress. These aspirations are very poetical, but also thoroughly impracticable. They exhibit what is desired rather than what can be accomplished. Regarding Roman Catholicism as a fact, M. Taine tries to estimate the nature of the forces which sustain, and of those which counteract it.

The first is the preponderance of rights. A savage, an infant, an uncultured mind, requires a sign in place of the thing signified: this is either a fetish as in Africa, or the image of a saint, as in the Middle Ages. The same want is still felt by a Sabine shepherd or a peasant of Brittany. To them a finger of St. Yves, a garment of St. Francis, or a statue of the Virgin, is God. In their estimation a vow performed, a fast kept, beads rightly counted, a medal kissed with fervour, constitute true piety. As knowledge extends, these mechanical observances are abandoned. This has occurred among the educated classes in France since the seventeenth century.

The second force is the possession of a complete and fixed system of metaphysics. On this account Roman Catholicism is always in direct antagonism to experimental science. Every day, however, the contest between the two is becoming more and more favourable to the latter. The discoveries of science are being accepted as facts it is impossible to dispute, and are taking rank among the commonplaces of mankind. In time they must be accepted by the whole body of the Roman Catholics as they now are by a few among them, and the metaphysics of the Church will then fall into as great disrepute as image worship. Both of these are dead forces, operating merely from their acquired velocity. The following are living, that is, are always supplied with fresh impulses.

In the first place may be ranked a "Monarchical Church," skilfully organized, standing alone, and aiding governments to maintain order and obedience. Such a Church serves to bridle the socialistic passions which threaten modern society. The more a people, like the French or the Austrians, submits to a yoke, the more attached is it to the Roman Catholic Church. So long as a people like the French consents to place the supreme power in the hands of an individual, and forego personal freedom, so long is it likely to have the Pope for its spiritual head.

Mysticism is the second of the vital forces. In our day men have grown very accessible to external impressions, and inclined to seek a refuge in the poetry of religion from the mental doubts which trouble them. To such persons there is something soothing in the worship of the Virgin. In women the tendency is even more marked, for they are exposed to the same difficulties as men without being affected by the same counteracting influences. Wearied with the monotony of existence, and longing for a brighter prospect, they find consolation and composure in the practices of the Church and belief in all its tenets. The mystical passion for a saint gives them more unalloyed pleasure than love for an earthly sinner.

Roman Catholicism, then, may undergo the following transformation. Its rites may be modified for all but the ignorant, its system of metaphysics fall to the ground except in schools, the ranks of its hierarchy be closed up, and its sentimental doctrines be expanded. It will then appeal chiefly to governments and to women, be at once a political power, and a refuge for stricken souls. Nothing but the ascendancy of a new religion will overturn it; a people never quits one form of religion but to embrace another. In the course of a century or two it may be menaced with a new form of Protestantism, that of Schleiermacher and Bunsen, brought into harmony with the demands of civilization and science, and fitted to be embraced by that higher class which, under the influence of Voltaire and Rousseau, adopted deism. Should Roman Catholicism emerge unchanged out of such a struggle, it may be considered immortal, and the prophecy of Macaulay will be realized.

The great charm of this work is its comprehensiveness. Of this no extracts or any sketch can convey an adequate notion. Many questions of great interest are discussed in it, to which we have made no reference. Indeed, a volume of this kind cannot be judged from a single chapter, any more than the character of a city can be learnt from traversing a single street. Unless we greatly err, all who travel through Italy out of curiosity, or sojourn there from choice, will find it needful to consult the work of M. Taine. When completed, it will long continue to be the standard work on the subject. Among the dignitaries of the Romish Church it will never be popular, yet they will find it very useful. The hatred which they have vented on M. Edmond About and M. Renan will, for a time, be diverted into a new channel. At Rome, M. Taine is certain to be regarded and denounced as the representative in human form of the roaring lion, that delights in devouring the Pope's faithful subjects.

In his own country he is already loathed and feared by those whose understandings have been distorted by bigotry. The clerical authorities of the Sorbonne have decided that no candidate for a degree shall be permitted to publish a thesis upholding the doctrines which he originated and advocates. This is a high testimony in his favour. It must always be gratifying to a thinker to be dreaded by the co-religionists of the persecutor of Galileo. Next

to the honour of being universally applauded is that of being denounced by those whose approval is dishonouring.

In addition to being an acute critic, M. Taine is a true artist. He does not, it is true, handle either pencil or chisel; but the giving colour to canvas or life to marble, is but one medium for artistic display. To compose a book is a fine art. Unfortunately, most writers fancy that they have done enough in recording their opinions with accuracy, and in language which correctly expresses their thoughts. That the materials should be grouped together in the best order, and toned down so as to produce the maximum of effect, is usually so little heeded as to be left unattempted. Indeed, the rule is to write what comes first, and leave the rest to the printer. Frenchmen are more sensitive on these points than Germans and Englishmen. They have a taste for symmetry and a knowledge of proportion. They hold that writing ought to give pleasure as well as teach, that for different classes of subjects there is an appropriate drapery, for every kind of discussion an appropriate form. In carrying these maxims into practice, M. Taine has shown himself a master. He deals with his paragraphs as a painter harmonizes his colours. His diction is always in keeping with the subject, and is finished almost to excess. When regarding the epithets and images he employs, we are as much struck with the affluence of his mind as with their appositeness.

Although less ambitious a performance, yet we should rank this work as highly as his "History of English Literature." Written rather to express opinions than illustrate a system, it pleases us all the more. While perusing it we are not obliged to pause and ask ourselves: does this deduction which professes to be scientific, tally with actual facts? Although when seeking for the soul of a writer in his works, M. Taine is always ingenious and thoughtful, yet he does not impress us so powerfully as when, in the presence of a great work of art, or a rare specimen of natural scenery, he is fraught with emotion, and strives to make his readers partners in his feelings. Combining a love for science with a fine taste, and possessing a large knowledge of literature, he treats all questions on broad principles, and from a lofty point of view. Herein lies his strength. But the strongest man has his weak side, the most comprehensive thinker omits some element from his calculations; even a philosopher is a mortal. In our opinion the weakness of M. Taine is as natural as it is pardonable. Quick to discern the shortcomings of others, eagerly desiring to avoid similar faults, he exerts himself with laudable energy to render his conclusions proof against attack. Perceiving intellectual processes to be analogous to physical ones in this, that both can be comprehended only when all the necessary facts have been collected, classified, and verified, he has devoted himself to the patient massing of facts in order to deduce therefrom conclusions revealing the character of our mental states in terms which cannot be challenged. In many cases he attains what he thinks to be demonstrated truth. We have already given our reasons for differing from him in so thinking. We may now add that, while ready to hail his success as freely as any other indisputable fact, we not only doubt the possibility but also the utility of its accomplishment.

Annihilation itself is not a more appalling prospect than that of the day when everything shall be intelligible, when a formula shall be the key to unlock every secret of Nature, when there shall be nothing to strive after, for there will be nothing to learn. To grope in the dark may be unpleasant, but to be exposed to the untempered blaze of the sun is equally disagreeable. To blunder in our estimates of authors and their works is humiliating only when we are conscious that our errors are due to carelessness in collecting facts and heedlessness or partiality in weighing them. The critic may some day be endowed with an infallible instrument by which to probe the human mind and discover its secrets. We have no ambition to possess that magical wand. Enough is it for us, as it was for Lessing, to be always pursuing the truth, knowing well that we chase a divine phantom, knowing also, however, that the delight of the chase is infinitely preferable to the surfeit of possession. Our homage is paid to the Goddess Truth all the more heartily and reverently because we believe her to be far

"Too bright and good
For human nature's daily food."

Contemporary Literature.

The Foreign Books noticed in the following sections are chiefly supplied by Messrs. Williams & Norgate, *Henrietta-street, Covent-garden, and* Mr. Nutt, 270, *Strand.*

Theology and Philosophy.

Mr. Donaldson continues his valuable Introduction to the History of Christian Literature and Doctrine in the Ante-Nicene Period by two volumes containing the Apologists.[1] The principal writers of whose works an account is here given are Justin Martyr, Tatian, Theophilus, and Athenagoras. The method pursued is the same as in the previous volume; the history of the works, the history of the authors so far as it may be known, and an abstract of their doctrines, are given under separate heads. There is prefixed an introduction, which gives a fair and impartial estimate of the characteristics of this portion of the Patristic literature. The title Apologists is at first apt to mislead, and the modern reader, on his becoming acquainted

[1] "A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine, from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council." By James Donaldson, M.A. Vols. II., III. The Apologists. London: Macmillan and Co. 1866.

with these authors, will assuredly experience a feeling of disappointment. The arguments appear *jejune* and beside the mark; but they are not to be taken as replies to systematic attacks upon Christianity. They "are not apologies for Christianity," they are apologies for Christians accused of crimes, of impieties and immoralities, of conspiring against the well-being of the State and of society. They endeavour to enlist the common sense and sense of justice of the emperors to whom most of them were addressed on behalf of the Christians exposed to persecution from the heathen populace and from subordinate authorities, because their tenets and practices were misunderstood. The policy of the Emperors Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius was favourable to the progress of Christianity, and enlightened views of imperial policy led to the foundation of educational and charitable foundations bearing a resemblance to those which grew up under the Christian system. The difficulty which Christianity had to encounter lay principally with the masses, who still believed in polytheism, and were attached to its observances. The cultus of the gods penetrated the whole of social life. The Christian, in withdrawing himself from idolatrous observances, was compelled to withdraw himself from society, and became in popular estimation at once an atheist and an enemy of the human race. Hence the imputation of Thyestean banquets and Œdipodean intercourse, which received a shadowy confirmation from reports of the Eucharistic ceremonies and the feasts of charity. In repelling the accusations against themselves, the Christians necessarily retorted upon the Pagans the corruption of their own society, authorized as it was by the scandalous stories in their mythology, which, however contemned or explained by the wiser, were taken literally by the vulgar. Then there arose the discussion on the relation of Christianity to Philosophy. The Apologists recognise in the philosopher a certain insight into divine truth, but feeble compared with that which dwelt in the prophets. Philosophy was variable and self-contradictory, Christianity alone stable and consistent. The philosophic teaching with which the Apologists show the greatest affinity is that of Socrates and Plato, or of certain schools derived from Plato, the influence of Aristotle in this period being unknown. With Stoicism Christianity had much in common on its moral and social side, and was in fact greatly indebted to it; speculatively, the two repelled each other. "The impersonal character of the Stoic Divinity closed up the Stoic heart against Christianity," and *vice versâ*. In the department of what would be called, in modern phrase, the Evidences of Christianity, the Apologists are very meagre and deficient; they rely principally on the argument from prophecy, exemplifying it in the most far-fetched interpretations of the passages of the Old Testament as significant of Christ. Whatever its comparative merits relatively to Paganism, if Christianity had had nothing better to rely upon than Justin's argument from prophecy, it would never have conquered the world. Mr. Donaldson then sketches the growth of the doctrine of the Logos which appears in this period, derived from or having a close affinity with the Philonian doctrine. By a necessary logical development there issued from it the dogma of the Deity of Christ, which as yet was held only in the vaguest manner. We cannot follow Mr. Donaldson through his analysis of the writings of the several Apologists, and add only a brief extract from this candid and impartial work. We give the following the rather as not entirely agreeing with it:—

"There seems not the slightest reason for the opinion that the Church was divided into a Pauline and a Petrine party. The reasons which have been assigned for this opinion will be discussed as they come up in treating of the various writers. The Christians acted towards each other with charity. They permitted differences of opinion in regard to the divinity of Christ. They permitted differences of opinion in regard to the observance of the Passover. But towards the end of our period a mighty change came over the Church; and we shall find the most violent passions, the keenest bigotry, and the most absurd dogmatism play very prominent parts. And this is what we might expect. The Church was liberal during the Apologetic days, because from ignorant simplicity and childlike love it was indifferent to outward observances and to speculative opinions. As soon as Christians come to attach any value to outward observances and to dogmas, a spirit of intolerance will show itself." (Vol. ii. p. 47.)

Mr. Merivale's lectures,[2] both the present and the previous series, have the value of illustrating the truth that there is no absolute break in the history of religion any more than in any other human history. But in exemplifying this truth in the instance of the growth of Christianity, the author has found himself on very delicate ground. The usual dogmatic prepossessions concerning the nature of a Divine Revelation are very much against it, and it cuts away, or at least seriously imperils, a very common argument for the miraculous origin and propagation of Christianity. It is very generally urged that the excellences of Christianity presented an impediment to its reception by the Pagan nations, which could only be overcome by a special Divine interposition—that it made its way in spite of them by a supernatural aid. Mr. Merivale shows, on the other hand, that its very excellences materially assisted its reception. The object of the Boyle lecturer was to show the coherence of Revelation with the Order of Providence; he has in consequence exposed himself to the imputation, in some quarters, of resolving it into the Order of Providence. He has been reminded that to argue the divinity of the Revelation from its correspondence to the real wants and best anticipations of Pagan human nature is at best a two-edged sword. Such representations have apparently produced their effect; at any rate, and from whatever cause, we have to complain

[2] "The Conversion of the Northern Nations. The Boyle Lectures for the Year 1865." Delivered at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. By Charles Merivale, B.D., Rector of Lawford, Chaplain to the Speaker of the House of Commons. London: Longmans. 1866.

that Mr. Merivale sets himself from time to time to blunt effectually one of the edges of his too trenchant weapon. He both refrains from pushing home his general argument, and he presents contradictory views of historical details. The particular purpose of the present set of lectures is to show that in the coherent progress of the Christian religion in the world it was to be embraced by Teutons as well as by Greeks, and to take up into itself ethical elements from the German peoples, as it had adopted philosophical conceptions from the schools of Athens and Alexandria.

"God had other races of men, other habits of mind and spiritual training, to bring into the confession of faith in Him and in His Gospel; and He required the teaching of His Word to be placed upon a broader foundation, to be developed from a deeper source; that Christ might become the Desire of another people, the Light and Life of a new world of humanity."—p. 20.

Now it does not appear to us that Mr. Merivale perceives the great difficulty of maintaining the intermediate position which he takes up between the antagonistic theories of the natural and supernatural propagation of Christianity. At one moment we anticipate that his knowledge of history must oblige him to modify the notion of a sacred deposit of faith containing implicitly all doctrine afterwards rendered explicit, yet always self-evolved; but anon, his dogmatism and ecclesiasticism compel him to justify as truths the Athanasian and Augustinian theology, together with the Sacramental system of the Church. He conceives, as he tells us, the Christian idea of religion to be based upon the annunciation to man by Jesus Christ, of his corrupt and fallen state, and of the mode of his restoration; that it is quite different from that of the heathen world, and from the conceit of personal merit which "colours every deviation from the Catholic doctrine of the Divine Nature, sometimes even among those who have been bred and baptized in the true faith of the Holy Trinity." (p. 46.) It was the great work of Augustine, "although his books on the Trinity are scarcely less scientific than those of Athanasius," to establish "the doctrine of human corruption, of original sin, and the need of grace Divine." In the heresies alike of Arius and Pelagius we "recognise the same restless activity of our inbred Paganism;" in the great controversies carried on by Athanasius and Augustine we are to perceive how Providence "raised a barrier against Paganism in the genuine deductions from Scripture of the Church and her doctors." Of Augustine it is further said, "that he has been for fifteen centuries the salt of Christian divinity, every revival of religion has drawn strength from his medicinal waters." So far, indeed, from these lectures presenting really any valuable demonstration of the historical progress of Christianity, their real tendency is to insinuate, under the cloak of a few plausible historical illustrations, the narrowest and most unmitigated dogmatism. Perfectly determined is Mr. Merivale to guard himself from all suspicion of complicity with any of the floating heresies of the day; he cannot, therefore, notice the noble qualifications of Origen without appending a somewhat halting, yet thorough, condemnation of his Universalism:—

"He believes in the ultimate reconciliation of all men, of every soul of man, and of devils also, to God; for so widely, so fancifully, does he interpret the promised restoration of all things. If this be an error in fact—as certainly it exceeds the limits of the revealed—it is, at least, a generous error. If it be a heresy, it is one which has found, and is likely, perhaps, to find, few followers. If it is too bold, there are few, perhaps, who will have the courage to embrace it. But the Church of God is a jealous Church, and to the Church it savoured of Paganism; it augured that reaction of vain human imaginations against which it was the sacred mission of the Church to guard."—p. 37.

We have said the particular object of the present set of lectures is to show how in the providential order the Northern nations were adapted to contribute special elements to the growth of Christianity. How does the Lecturer deal with the questions which thereupon arise? Do we owe certain elements in Western and modern society rather to Christianity or to race? With these questions Mr. Merivale does not really grapple, and where he touches upon them entangles himself in contradictions. We may instance his treatment of the relation of the Gothic principle of loyalty to Christianity. The Greek or Roman, we are truly told, conceived and felt patriotism; certainly he did not owe it to Christianity; "of loyalty he had no conception," neither of submission to impersonal law, nor of attachment to a personal sovereign. "Patriotism was a Pagan virtue," "but loyalty," according to Mr. Merivale, "is a Christian grace;" although loyalty is as little to be found in the New Testament as patriotism, nor ever appeared in Christianity "until the conquerors from the North brought it straight with them from their deserts." If this principle, then, is found with the Northerns when they are not Christian, and not found with other peoples when they are Christian, the philosophical historian would conclude that it must be a Northern characteristic; but the Boyle Lecturer desires to prove it a "Christian grace," and therefore, "Christianity interpreted to them their own instinct," because "this is the very type of the relation of the believer to God;" strange, then, that Christianity should not have proclaimed it before. Equally hampered is the lecturer with the position of woman in Christianity. He acknowledges the Teutonic origin of the romantic sentiment, but he prefers to found the equality of woman to man, as recognised in modern Christianity, on a dogmatic basis—that "God sent forth his Son made of a woman." If man denies Christianity, he will deny the spiritual claims of woman. "For so he did in antiquity; so do, perhaps, all existing heathenism; so threaten to do all modern unbelief and scepticism"—a hardy assertion; for we suppose Mr. Merivale would have called Comte an unbeliever and Parker a sceptic. But this dogmatic basis has peculiar difficulties of its own. The birth of Christ, we are told, of "a Virgin-Mother," is

the "charter" and "pledge of woman's equality with man;" it would surely be a pledge of much more. "It puts to shame mythologies," which seems a very hazardous allusion. And we are warned at the same time against "the elevation to the place of accepted dogma of the most extravagant of human inventions;" yet half Christendom accepts this most extravagant invention as a necessary corollary from the "test and token of a general revelation." To the unbeliever, it need scarcely be said, two Immaculate Conceptions present no greater difficulty than one, nor the deification of a woman greater difficulty than the deification of a man. The conclusion of the whole series of discourses presents an example of playing fast and loose which we have rarely seen surpassed. "Development," which has carried Mr. Merivale to perilous heights of dogma, becomes "fiction" when it exaggerates the humble "Virgin-Mother" into a divinity; the Church, in which but now male and female were on a line of spiritual equality, becomes the "masculine Church of the Apostles," not to be moulded to the imaginations of female votaries;" the men "to whom the power of preaching and teaching is given," are not to "surrender their prerogative of thought and reasoning and criticism;" the Church is not to "work upon female impulses and fancies," lest it "lose as rapidly as it will gain;" "if the women enter in at the one door, the men will go out at the other;" which strikes us as a very strange exemplification of the spiritual equality of the sexes.

Mr. Mozley's "Bampton Lectures" on the subject of Miracles,[3] correspond neither to his reputation nor to his power, nor yet to the greatness of the occasion. "There has arisen," he says, "in a certain class of minds, an apparent perception of the impossibility of suspensions of physical law;" he proposes, therefore, to address himself mainly to the question of the credibility of miracles, only touching subordinately on their use and the evidences of them. On these latter points he has not, indeed, dwelt at so great a length as on the former, but he bases the whole of his discussion on an assumption of the use of miracles, even of their necessity in the case of a Revelation, and in the case of the Christian Revelation in particular; and he specially examines the proposition, that "no testimony can reach to the supernatural," of which, in a certain sense, he admits the truth. But—considering the growing strength of the "apparent perception" of the impossibility of miracles, or at least of the presumption against their occurrence from the conviction of the mutual coherence and relativity of the universe as a whole, the substitution of the conception of revelations by orderly growth for that of revelations *per saltum*, as well as the persuasion, becoming more and more widely spread by reason of modern investigation into the Christian *Origines*, of the weakness of the evidence whereon the miracles with which we are principally concerned must rest—it does surprise us that Mr. Mozley should have contented himself with going round again in the old circle traced by Butler and Paley in their arguments with the Deists. Mr. Mozley is equally behindhand in his argument for the possibility of miracles, as not excluded by our experience of the uniformity of nature hitherto. For the presumption with which the maintainer of miracles has in these days to contend is much more than a mere presumption in favour of repetition, or expectation of the recurrence of events like those already experienced; it is a presumption against any break in the implication or continuity of co-existences. The mere repetition of the rising of the sun, considered as an isolated phenomenon or event during the whole human experience hitherto, may not exclude the possibility of its ceasing to rise; we may have no valid or sufficient reason to infer, from the mere fact of the repetition hitherto, the necessity of continuance. Mr. Mozley does not, as it seems to us, push his argument farther than that. The scientific, or we may say rational presumption, with which he really has to contend is, that the sun will continue to rise as long as other astronomical conditions remain the same as heretofore. The miracle of which he ought to vindicate the possibility, the reasonableness, the conceivableness, is one which supposes unlike consequences from like antecedents, unlike effects from like causes and conditions, unlike products from like factors, different sums from identical items. To the Reason, which regards the universe as a whole, made up of mutually interdependent parts, the withdrawal of any part is inconsistent with the continuance of the rest, the orderly function of the whole is made up of the constant and ascertained function of its constituents. Nor can the immediate action of the *Deus ex machinâ* be assumed, for he is not suspended above the other agents, but is the spring which is already moving them all. The divine universe is as a mighty equation, which subsists as long as equivalent operations only are performed upon its members; if an addition or subtraction be made on one side only its balance is destroyed. Thus there is a growing persuasion (and it is this particular persuasion in our educated minds with which we consider Mr. Mozley has not attempted to deal) that a miracle of particular immediate intervention in the universe implies a contradiction, the rest of the universe being by the hypothesis left as before; for if it were not left as before there would be no miracle or interposition. The problem suggested by the conception of the universe, as a whole of coexistent parts, which Mr. Mozley has to solve, may be simplified into such a form as this; an equilateral triangle is also equiangular, and it is not conceivable, or possible even, for a miracle to make a triangle otherwise than equiangular, so long as it remains equilateral. It has long been admitted in theology, that it is beyond the power of the Deity to change the past—

[3] "Eight Lectures on Miracles." Preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1865, on the foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A., Canon of Salisbury. By J. B. Mozley, B.D., Vicar of Old Shoreham, late Fellow of Magdalen College. London: Rivingtons. 1865.

Μόνον γὰρ ἀνδν κὸ θεὸς στερίσκεται
Ἀγένητα ποιεῖν ἅττ ἂν ἡ πεπραγμένα,—

in other words, to interfere with relations in the order of succession. It is, we apprehend, coming to be acknowledged also as a theological truth, that it would imply a contradiction of himself were the Deity supposed to interfere with the relations of things in the order of coexistence. Incompletely as Mr. Mozley has dealt with the abstract question of miracle, he is still less satisfactory in his assumption of the necessity of miracle in the case of the Christian Revelation. He puts it as follows, in a remarkable passage, which we must transscribe:—

"If a person of evident integrity and loftiness of character rose into notice in a particular country and community eighteen centuries ago, who made these communications about himself: that he had existed before his natural birth, from all eternity, and before the world was, in a state of glory with God; that he was the only-begotten Son of God; that the world had been made by him; that he had, however, come down from heaven, and assumed the form and nature of man for a particular purpose—viz., to be the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world; that he thus stood in a mysterious and supernatural relation to the whole of mankind; that through him alone mankind had access to God; that he was the head of an invisible kingdom, into which he should gather all generations of righteous men who had lived in the world; that on his departure hence he should return to heaven, to prepare mansions for them; and lastly, that he should descend at the end of the world to judge the whole human race, on which occasion all that were in their graves should hear his voice, and come forth, they that had done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that had done evil unto the resurrection of damnation—if this person made these assertions about himself, and all that was done was to make the assertions, what would be the inevitable conclusion of sober reason respecting that person? *The necessary conclusion of sober reason respecting that person would be that he was disordered in the understanding.*"—pp. 14, 15.

We have put in italics the alternative which Mr. Mozley states with a terseness and a harshness from which a Strauss would have shrunk, but which the orthodox controversialists may hereafter find they have unwisely adopted. It is *πρὸ τύφρων τάττεσθαι*; the courage lent thereby is artificial, but the ruin upon defeat complete. The argument, if such it may be called, is thus stated: "By no rational being could a just and benevolent life be accepted as proof of such astonishing announcements. Miracles are the necessary complement, then, of such announcements, which, without them, are purposeless and abortive"—that is to say, the announcements, being incredible in themselves, prove thereby the truth of the miracles which are requisite to attest them; and the miracles, in their turn, though incredible in themselves, being thus proved to be true, prove in return the truth of the incredible announcements. It is due, indeed, to Mr. Mozley to point out that he does consider elsewhere the evidence for the Gospel miracles, or some of them, to be in itself so conclusive as to enable the acceptance of them at the same time that the mediæval miracles are rejected. And we are amazed at the simplicity with which he puts forth such a statement as the following (the italics are ours):—

"That certain great and cardinal Gospel miracles which, if granted, clear away all antecedent objection to the reception of the rest, *possess contemporary testimony, must be admitted by everybody*, at the peril of invalidating all historical evidence, and involving our whole knowledge of the events of the past in doubt. That the first promulgators of Christianity asserted, as a fact which had come under the cognizance of their senses, the Resurrection of our Lord from the dead, is as certain as anything in history." (p. 217.)

We do not at all see that the fear of throwing doubt upon other histories is philosophically or morally a ground for "admitting that we possess contemporary testimony" in the Gospel histories, if those writings are not proved to be the work of contemporaries. Nor can we see that the refusal to admit that we "possess contemporary testimony" to a history incredible itself, when the contemporaneousness of the authors has not been shown, can involve in doubt our knowledge of the Peloponnesian war, or the conquest of Gaul, or the Peninsular campaigns, which are not incredible in themselves and are recorded by undoubted contemporaries—Thucydides, Cæsar, and the Duke of Wellington. When Mr. Mozley has further investigated the authorship of the books of the New Testament he will probably speak with more reserve of the "first promulgators of Christianity" asserting that the resurrection of Jesus from the dead was a fact which had come under the cognizance of their senses.

We have the first part before us of a most valuable work by Professor Kuenen of Leyden, made generally accessible in the translation of a thorough scholar and advanced theologian, and recommended by a brief introduction by M. Renan.[4] It is seldom that three such names are seen borne on one title-page. The author undertakes to present a history of the Hebrew literature, properly so called, as far as it is preserved to us from the earliest times; in other words, a history of the literature of the Old Testament. The history of this literature will reflect during the period over which its composition ranges the intellectual, moral, and religious characteristics of the people itself. A divine product, so far as the authors obeyed the higher movements of the Divine Spirit, is at the same time a human product, and must present phenomena common to it with other compositions on kindred subjects, by men of other races. And even if it presents the appearance of a whole, more penetrated than any other native literature that we know of with a religious spirit, and directed, with some few ex-

[4] "Histoire Critique des Livres de l'Ancien Testament." Par A. Kuenen, Docteur en Théologie et en Philosophie, Professeur à l'Université de Leyde. Traduite par M. A. Pierson, Docteur en Théologie et en Philosophie, avec une Préface de M. Ernest Renan, Membre de l'Institut. Tome premier, des Livres Historiques. Paris. 1866.

ceptions to religious ends, we are the rather engaged to trace the conditions under which the peculiar growth took its exceptional form. A capital question in these inquiries undoubtedly is that which concerns the dates and authorship of the books themselves; for the significance of the literature as a whole, and of its several parts, will be altogether different, according as it shall be found to have been spread in the time of its composition over a period of fifteen hundred years, or of a thousand, or of five hundred. The books of the Old Testament were distributed by the Jews themselves at the commencement of the Christian era into the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings: a division still preserved in our Hebrew Bibles. The "five books," so called, of Moses, constitute the Law; the Prophets consist of the prophetical history, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and of the prophetical books properly so called, Daniel excepted; the Writings comprised the Psalms and the didactic books, together with Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Chronicles. A more natural distribution of the literature, according to its subject matter, is followed by Professor Kuenen, into—1. The historical books; 2. The prophetical books; 3. The poetical and didactic books. In the present volume the dates and origin of the historical books are treated of. The discussions connected with the Pentateuch occupy about half of a volume of six hundred pages. The principal conclusions in respect to it at which the learned Professor arrives are the following: The Decalogue, in a shorter form than it exists at present, together with a few other ordinances, are all that Moses left in writing. The spirit of the great legislator may have exercised a powerful influence upon the formation of the religious, moral, and political life of the nation; but in the age of Moses himself there was neither room, nor occasion, nor means for an elaborate written legislation. The non-Mosaic documents comprised in the Pentateuch commence with the reign of David, when some regulations for worship and life, already in practice, were committed to writing, (Book of the Covenant). Shortly after the building of the Temple by Solomon, a priest or Levite composed the book which commences with the Creation of the world and concludes with the conquest of Canaan—having for its principal object the regulation of the public worship; but this book was not published, and, remaining in the hands of the clergy, received additions and modifications from time to time (Book of Origins). In the reign of Manasseh some unknown prophet, desirous of exterminating idolatry and of engaging the people in the sole worship of Jehovah, composed the Book of Deuteronomy, modifying in some respects the original Mosaic institutions, and insisting especially on the obligation of a central worship at Jerusalem. With these ends in view, he would by no means conceive that he was falsifying, though fictitiously ascribing his work to the great legislator himself. Fifty years later the principles of the Deuteronomist were carried into effect by the reform of Josiah. The general revision, with occasional modification and interpolation, of the Pentateuch thus formed, was accomplished by a priest of Jerusalem, living about the commencement of the Exile; the question, however, is left open, whether the final revision of the Pentateuch were not posterior to the Exile, and possibly due to Ezra. With respect to the contents of the Pentateuchal writings, they may be classed under two heads—the legislative and the historical material. The legislation of the Pentateuch is by no means Mosaic, if by that term is to be understood that it was formally the production of Moses himself; in another sense, namely that it carried out a principle which may believed to have originated with him of consecrating a chosen people specially devoted to the service of Jehovah, there is a fundamental truth in the Jewish and Christian traditions which set forth the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. But then, secondly, the events narrated are not traceable, even those which represent the Exodus and the giving of the law in Sinai, to any contemporary record; the form of the history is rather to be considered as a clothing of received ideas respecting the relation of the Hebrew people to Jehovah. Much less are the patriarchal histories supported by any contemporary evidence, or even trustworthy tradition. The first part of Genesis is merely a collection of Semitic traditions, some based on fact, others merely legendary—orally transmitted at first, afterwards committed to writing, and bearing the impress of the Israelitish conceptions prevalent from the tenth to the eighth century before the Christian era—and what is true of Genesis is in greater or less degree true of the Pentateuch generally:

"La critique moderne lui a rendu sa vérité essentielle, son vrai sens. Assurément, le Pentateuque n'est plus ce qu'il a longtemps été au point de vue insoutenable de la tradition ordinaire; un écrit authentique du grand legislateur. Mais, en revanche, ce recueil est aujourd'hui et sera toujours pour les esprits éclairés un des documents les plus remarquables de la littérature d'un peuple que d'étranges et de hautes destinées rendent toujours plus digne de l'attention des penseurs."—p. 298.

Professor Kuenen's analysis of the other historical books is equally complete—the account of the traces of perished books, referred to in Kings and Chronicles, is exhaustive. He acknowledges the historical character of the bulk of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, while he fixes on reasonable grounds their final revision to the same date as that of the Chronicles, about 330 before the Christian era. Professor Kuenen has a thorough mastery of his materials, and a calm and impartial judgment.

The treatise of M. Nicolas on the Apocryphal Gospels forms a sequel and complement to his previous Biblical Essays.[1] The Founder of Christianity left nothing in writing; and for a considerable period, which we need not here undertake to define, the disciples and adherents of his religion expected his speedy return, to set up on earth his kingdom of righteousness.

[1] "Études sur les Évangiles Apocryphes." Par Michel Nicolas. Paris. 1866.

The composition of histories of his earthly life during his first manifestation would be held superfluous in the earliest age, and even might be misleading; so that Papias in the second century expressed his preference for the oral over the written tradition. But on a sudden, as it were, there springs up a most copious literature, partly because the expectation of that speedy final personal Revelation was beginning to die out; partly because, as Christianity came in contact with various religions and philosophies, they began both to borrow from it and to lend to it, and the product in the literary regions of the world took a literary form. Christianity also spread itself among persons of all degrees of culture in their several schools; and the products of which we are speaking were adapted to the appreciation of minds more or less discerning, more or less vulgar and obtuse. It may be allowed that in literary merit the Apocryphal Gospels, as far as we possess remains of them, fall very much below those which Christians afterwards generally agreed to designate as canonical, although there are not wanting points of contact and similarity between them. To some extent also the differences observable between the Canonical Gospels severally, may be accounted for by differences in the intellectual and religious condition of their authors or compilers, with their consequent special aims and tendencies, and by differences in educational condition of those for whom they were particularly designed. The mutual contrasts, however, which the Apocryphal Gospels present, are very marked; and M. Nicolas has done well in distributing those productions into different and, for the most part, obviously distinguishable classes—the Judaizing, the anti-Judaizing, and the Orthodox. The arrangement of his material is generally satisfactory, although in some cases we should not be disposed to agree with him—as in ranging the Gospel which Justin Martyr appears to have followed in the same Judaizing section with the Gospel of the Ebionites. His treatment, under the second head, of the question as to the relation between the Gospel of Marcion and our present third Gospel, is singularly clear and temperate. M. Nicolas has the courage to withhold a peremptory judgment when the evidence is deficient; he neither thinks it proved that Marcion mutilated the Gospel of Luke, for if he had mutilated it of the passages not found in the Gospel which he used, dogmatic reasons would have led him to carry his mutilation further; nor that the compiler of the third Gospel amplified the Marcionite Gospel, for which there is no historical evidence, although as a hypothesis it squares with the facts at least equally well with the preceding. M. Nicolas rather inclines to the opinion of there having been in circulation longer and shorter copies of our present third Gospel, some becoming "acclimatized," as he calls it, in some regions or churches, others in others; and that Marcion, with his master, Cerdo, before him, had found the shorter form current and adopted it, but without any design of falsification. The last part of the work of M. Nicolas abounds in curious details, and his readers are led to perceive what an extended and long-continued influence has been exercised upon Christianity by the Apocryphal Gospels of the third class, although they were not admitted by the Church to the rank of the Canonical Scriptures.

"Ecce Homo"[6] is a plausible attempt to repair the damage done by modern inquiries to the traditional dogmatical conception of the person of Jesus Christ. It professes to be the result of a reconsideration of the whole subject, and to trace the biography of Christ from the time when as yet he bore no such name, but was simply a young man of promise, as St. Luke describes him, "popular with those who knew him, and appearing to enjoy the Divine favour." The conclusions which the author professes to have accepted are not necessarily "those which church doctors, or even apostles, have sealed with their authority, but which the facts themselves, critically weighed, appear to warrant." The precise question treated in the present volume is stated to be, "What was Christ's object in founding the society which is called by his name, and how is it adapted to attain that object?" What the author means by a critical weighing of the facts themselves we are at a loss to understand. There is not even a pretence of analysing the "biographies" of Christ which have come down to us. It is conceded that "nothing can be more natural than that exaggerations and even inventions should be mixed in our biographies with genuine facts" (p. 10); and the appearances at the baptism of Jesus were not such as necessarily to be miraculous, nor are the incidents of the temptation described to us by eye-witnesses. Nevertheless, though the account of the temptation rests on no very strong external evidence, and there may be exaggeration in its details, it can scarcely be otherwise than true in substance—first, because "truth is stranger than fiction," and because in its strangeness it is "nicely adapted to the character of Christ as we already know it"—that is to say, as "the Lamb of God," according to the phrase put by the fourth Evangelist into the mouth of the Baptist. The author supposes the temptation by "the Evil Spirit" to have been appropriate to the first dawning in the mind of Christ of the consciousness of his possession of supernatural power; and on this undoubted possession of supernatural power by Jesus, gathered as the result of what he calls "weighing the facts," the whole scheme is reared of "Ecce Homo." The Discourses of Jesus in all the Gospels are taken as authentic in the lump, from whence is derived a by no means novel argument—he who was endowed with such supernatural powers could assert nothing but truth concerning himself, and Christ did put forth "unbounded personal pretensions." We have here sufficient foundation for the whole of the Nicene and Athanasian dogmatism. And there is the strongest confirmation, according to our author, of the justice of these "unbounded personal pretensions" to be found in the con-

[6] "Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ." London: Macmillan and Co. 1866.

sideration, that no one who could rightly be described as a "Lamb of God" could have put them forth unless he had really been conscious that they were justified. Putting aside, however, the theological side of these "personal pretensions" Christ is represented to us in the "biographies" setting himself forth as Master and Lord and King of Men. We have here, again, to complain of the uncritical manner in which this discussion is conducted; there is not really the slightest attempt made to trace through the several Gospels the data we possess for forming an estimate as to what Christ's conception of his kingdom really was, to what extent the Messianic idea, and what kind of Messianic idea, entered into it, what modification it passed through in the course of the life of Jesus, how far it really rose above Judaic notions, or was or was not combined with millennial expectations; there is not the slightest attempt made to separate, in the claims put into the mouth of Christ in the Gospels, that which may reasonably be supposed to have belonged to himself from that which was derived from the conceptions of the biographers. There is much which is reasonable and sensible in the second part of the volume, entitled "Christ's Legislation," much which is descriptive of a true Christianity, of a true religion of humanity, although the treatment of the subject is vitiated here also by an uncritical, unpainstaking assignment of all which is excellent in Christianity to the conscious immediate operation of the "Founder" himself.

Without intending his work for a direct reply to that of M. Renan, M. de Pressensé acknowledges the necessity for Christianity in our own day of presenting a "Life of Christ,"[7] which will assign to that person an intelligible seat in the phenomenal history of the world. M. de Pressensé represents a school, the orthodox school of French Protestantism, although on several points there is an orthodoxy and a Protestantism more ultra than his own. On the subject, however, of the union of the two natures in the one person of Christ, M. de Pressensé is thoroughly orthodox. He protests against a doctrine which would reduce the humanity to a mere appearance, and render impossible any history of the earthly life of the Saviour; but he conceives that acknowledgment of his true humanity to be perfectly reconcilable with the perfect faith in his Divinity "which has been the universal belief of Christians for eighteen centuries." This work of M. de Pressensé's contrasts most favourably with that which has just been noticed: it is distinct, methodical, and intelligible in its conclusions. The author does not content himself with assuming a vague and ambiguous supernatural, but lays it down as an essential divergence of principle between himself and M. Renan!

"Nous avons le droit d'établir contre eux l'existence d'un ordre divin, en dehors et au-dessus de la nature, que nous pouvons appeler l'ordre surnaturel. Une fois qu'il est reconnu, nous ne pouvons limiter d'avance son action ou son intervention dans la nature, et il est logique d'admettre au moins la possibilité du miracle."—p. 25.

He then deals with the theistic objection to miracle—that, strictly speaking, there can be no supernatural to the universe in which the Deity is immanent—which he puts down with the assertion that such a doctrine is mere pantheism, and tends to confound the creation and the Creator. We should have, indeed, to express our own dissent from most of the philosophical or critical principles which M. de Pressensé invokes in the course of his treatise, but can indicate it as consistent on his side of the questions which it treats. He undertakes to establish the genuineness and authenticity of the narratives on which he depends, and he then keeps closely to them; he does not hesitate an instant from the miraculous conception to the miraculous Ascension; and he finally appeals to that which he terms a fifth Gospel, the internal assent which has been yielded from age to age by every Christian heart to the saving verities proclaimed in the life of Christ.

Those who can recall to mind the position of Roman Catholics in this country previous to the removal of their civil disabilities, and who from any cause have watched the progress of their church in England from that time to the present, will read with interest the "Life of Father Ignatius,"[8] whose "conversion" nearly synchronized with the first-named event. Protestantism in England had been dominant under an artificial protection; its dominance, therefore, was no evidence of its truth. On the removal of the artificial protection it was a sure consequence that the hitherto disabled religion would make many converts, as it has done, which is no proof of its truth, or comparative truth either. Many of these converts have been drawn from the ranks of "Evangelicalism." Dr. Newman's first religious impressions were "Evangelical," so were Mr. Spencer's; his theology, when a clergyman of the Church of England, was that of Thomas Scott. There is no doubt that the *selfism*, the desire of certitude for the *ego*, which is characteristic of Calvinism, may in some cases predispose for the acceptance of the claims of a Church which promises absolute certitude. Remnants of individualism will no doubt emerge in converts from Protestantism. Perhaps such are to be recognised in a disposition to become the founders of new orders, rules, colleges, institutions, or special works. The special work to which Father Ignatius devoted himself was that of the conversion of England, not directly, but by organizing a great system of prayers, aves, masses, of which the diffusive efficacy should operate to that end. Father Ignatius was not always without suspicion of some remaining leaven of Protestantism—at least he was found

[7] "Jesus Christ: son Temps, sa Vie, son Œuvre." Par E. de Pressensé. Paris. 1866.

[8] "Life of Father Ignatius of St. Paul, Passionist (the Hon. and Rev. George Spencer)." Compiled chiefly from his Autobiography, Journal, and Letters. By the Rev. Father Pius à Sp. Sancto, Passionist. Dublin: Duffy. 1866.

to be "grazing the brink of error," when he said in a sermon (in 1839), "I declare myself ready to renounce my belief, if it were sufficiently shown to me that the evidences on which I believe it to be divine are wrong. This is the spirit in which I wish all Catholics would offer themselves to discussion with our Protestant brethren." (p. 273.) On which his biographer observes, "The proposition that a Catholic and a Protestant may meet on equal terms to discuss their tenets, each open to conviction by the other's arguments, is simply erroneous and scandalous, to say nothing more." (p. 274.) So Father Ignatius was "of course called to order for his sermon," and "a word from the bishop is enough to make him retract." On another and later occasion there was no defect to be found in his "Catholic" spirit. About the year '50 or '51 he was going about asking for prayers for "unity," and was speaking with a roomful of Protestant clergymen on the subject; he made such an impression upon them, that they agreed to kneel down then and there and pray for unity, and asked Father Ignatius to join them, pressing him to do so on every side. On this "he jumped with indignation, and said, in a manner quite unusual to him, 'I'd rather be torn in pieces by forty thousand mad dogs, than say a prayer with you;'" the reason being "the law that forbids all Catholics to communicate with heretics in divine things." So Father Ignatius became more cautious how he invited Protestants to pray for unity. The amiability belonged to the man, the uncharitableness to his Church. This kindly-affectioned, somewhat weak and eccentric person, died suddenly while prosecuting his missions in Scotland, October 1st, 1864, at the age of sixty-five.

The desire shown by some Anglicans for further knowledge of the Eastern Episcopal Communions, has led Mr. Malan to translate from the Russian an account of the Church of Georgia,[9] which appears to date from the fourth century, but to have fallen now under the supremacy of the Czar. The interest shown in some quarters in various projects of ecclesiastical reunion leads us simply to note the book, although drier reading cannot easily be imagined.

We notice this and the following volume rather because of the names and positions of the authors, than from any substantial merits in the works themselves. Mr. Plumptre's Sermons[10] present a most watery Divinity of subdued Evangelicalism and ineffectual mediation—a Divinity which will instruct no one, an Evangelicalism which will not convert, and a mediation which is ineffectual to reconcile. At his Sermon on Justification by Faith, Luther would have spat or thrown his ink-bottle. The modern theologian may thank the preacher for the admission that in the foundation text on which this mighty doctrine — *articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ*—has been reared, the word translated "faith" (*emoonah*) is there alone so rendered, out of forty-nine times that it occurs in the Old Testament (p. 398): an observation which may set more fearless inquirers upon a more thorough investigation into the basis of the great Protestant doctrine. The Sermons generally are of the "Dangers and Safeguards" type.

It is really to be regretted that Mr. Maurice,[11] to whom so many — besides those of his own especial following — feel indebted for many things well said, done, and written in years gone by, should imagine himself still called upon to rectify everybody's views concerning the present and future of religion on every possible occasion; and that even an eccentric bishop cannot dilate rhetorically, *more suo*, upon Colenso, the cattle plague, and the coming of Antichrist, without its calling forth Mr. Maurice's present impressions concerning "Salvation," "Free-thinking," "Conversion," "Civilization and Christianity," "God and the Evil Spirits." The time comes for the soldier to repose upon his laurels.

In the second edition of his work on "The Emotions and the Will,"[12] Mr. Bain has recast some portions with the intention of bringing out still more plainly his doctrines of the genesis of the Will and of the Conscience, sense of Duty, or Moral Sense. The tendency of his work is eminently practical, and his views of the highest value in rational methods of education and of self-government. Indeed, he observes with great force, that a thorough and rigorous application of the doctrine of an innate moral sense would banish education altogether. He combats the notions of an innate sense in its more modified form, as presented by Dr. Whewell, as an Ideal or common Consciousness, in which all men share. Every judgment, whether on moral or other subject-matter, must be the judgment of an individual; truth of every kind must be truth to some one mind. And he pushes to the utmost the objection to a supposed ideal standard in collective conscience, derived from the observation of the most startling varieties and differences in human conduct and legislation, showing, as it would seem, δίκαια to be νόμῳ ὀν φύσει. As the upshot of the discussion on that important branch of his subject, Mr. Bain states his conclusion to be, as the result of *à posteriori* observation, that *the moral rules found to prevail in most if not in all communities, are grounded partly on Utility and partly on Sentiment* (p. 277), the Utility and

[9] "A Short History of the Georgian Church." Translated from the Russian of P. Joselian, and edited, with additional Notes, by the Rev. S. C. Malan, Vicar of Broadwindsor, Dorset. London: Saunders, Otley, and Co. 1866.

[10] "Theology and Life. Sermons chiefly on Special Occasions." By E. H. Plumptre, M.A., Professor of Divinity and Chaplain, King's College, London, Prebendary of St. Paul's. London: Alexander Strahan. 1866.

[11] "The Conflict of Good and Evil in our Day. Twelve Letters to a Missionary." By the Rev. F. D. Maurice, M.A., Incumbent of St. Peter's, Marylebone. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

[12] "The Emotions and the Will." By Alexander Bain, M.A., Professor of Logic in the University of Aberdeen. Second Edition. London: Longmans. 1865.

the Sentiment being also relative and variable. Mr. Bain, therefore, rejecting though he does the supposition of an innate sense of right in any form, does allow that certain rules grounded, even when they differ, in similar processes, do in fact prevail in all human communities, and that human beings are constituted so as to move easily and necessarily in certain grooves. And still keeping clear altogether of innate ideas, it might, we think, with advantage be further pointed out that human beings are specially constituted to develop the feeling of duty or "ought"—the same sense of "ought," even when they show it in the most dissimilar manners. The same sense of "ought" is felt when the Parsee leaves the corpse of his parent to be torn by birds, as when the European buries it. And it is peculiar to human beings, as far as we know, to be capable of developing this feeling of "ought;" a rudimentary moral sense may be generated in a dog, in ways which illustrate the production of the more perfect feeling in mankind, but not even a rudiment in lower animals; to acknowledge a special capacity for that development involves none of the difficulties or contradictions which belong to the hypothesis of innate ideas, and is of far more importance as furnishing guidance to the teacher.

An exposition of a philosophy of a very different kind is published from the papers of the late Mr. Joseph Green,[13] known to many as a friend, and indeed, co-worker with Mr. Coleridge, to many more as a distinguished surgeon and estimable man. In the memoir of Mr. Green prefixed to the present publication, it is said of Coleridge that he had an inveterate habit of magnifying the "projected" into the halfdone, and the "begun" as nearly complete. Admirers who had not taken the measure of his sanguine temperament, imagined that he most have left behind him an "Opus magnum" all but finished, which was to accomplish that revolution in philosophy of which he had so long announced himself as the high-priest. "But in truth," says Mr. Simon, "the existence of any such work was mere matter of moonshine. Coleridge had not left any available written materials for setting comprehensively before the public, in his own language and in an argued form, the philosophical system with which he wished his name to be identified" (p. 38). Mr. Green undertook to do so, and lest he should be unable to accomplish his design on its desired scale had prepared for publication the two volumes now given to the public, when his own death supervened in December, 1863. It need not be said that the doctrine here set forth is that of a Realism, founded on the assumption of typical factive ideas, Will-Acts of the Supreme Idea, cognisable by the intuitional Reason, as distinguished from the logical Understanding, and constituting Truth to it. Mr. Green also thoroughly adopted, and here expounds, Coleridge's doctrine that Christianity and philosophy, the two being rightly explained, are identical. The second of these two volumes is entirely devoted to that object, and is founded upon the doctrine of the Logos, or personal divine Reason the fount of all communicated Being and of all derivative Ideas, all things made by Him, lighting every man that cometh into the world—the Life the Light of men— "operative objectively to realize living wholes of parts in which each and all may attain to the highest excellence of being and subjectively operative to potentiate every conscious intelligence to the apprehension and conception of the Idea by which this reality is obtained" (ii. 67). The way in which the coincidence of the highest philosophy with Christian dogmas is carried out may be seen in the following favourable specimen:—

"The celebrated term *ὁμοούσιος*, associated as it unavoidably is with the doctrine of the 'eternal generation' of the Son, was deemed the stronghold of the controversy; and the proposal from the opposite party of substituting the term *ὁμοιούσιος*—of 'like' substance—was indignantly rejected by the orthodox Trinitarians. And it may be here observed that the doctrine of the Spiritual Philosophy fully coincides with that which, since the Council of Nice, the Church universally recognises as the truth; and necessarily so, since if the Son is to be conceived as divine and essential to the Godhead, He must be conceived as 'consubstantial' (that is, of the self-same Spirit or divine Will) with the Father: and God cannot be conceived as One in the Trinity otherwise than as the self-same divine Spirit self-hypostatic in each of the distinctions. And let it be recollected that this controversy is no idle logomachy. It is essential to the interests of our spiritual being to contemplate in the Godhead the distinctions which secure the idea of a personal God—namely, the Absolute Will self-affirmed as the Father, who cannot be contemplated otherwise than as above and unconfounded with the world: but who in His only-begotten Son is ever in the world, and is ever working for its heavenly restoration and integration; while all temptation to sever the idea of their absolute and indivisible union is forbidden by the contemplation of the one Spiritual life which they eternally enjoy."—Vol. ii. pp. 224, 225.

We may now descend once more to *terra*, if not to *terra firma;* and whatever other judgment may be passed upon his disquisitions, this merit belongs to Dr. M'Cosh, of generally clear and lucid expression;[14] he endeavours to clear his meaning to himself, and to enable his readers to follow him, and avoids, so far as may be, those technical phrases and pedantic formulas which repel many beginners from prosecuting their philosophical reading. He has not shaken himself equally free, nor, candidly speaking, considering his object, was it possible for him to do so, from personal references and citations. His object is to counteract what he conceives to be mischievous or erroneous in Mr. J. S. Mill's

[13] "Spiritual Philosophy: founded on the Teachings of the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge." By the late Joseph Henry Green, F.R.S., D.C.L. Edited, with a Memoir of the Author's Life, by John Simon, F.R.S., Medical Officer of H.M. Privy Coucil, &c. &c In two volumes. London: Macmillan and Co. 1865.

[14] "An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's 'Philosophy,' being a Defence of Fundamental Truths." By James McCosh, LL.D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Queen's College, Belfast, author of "The Method of Divine Government," "Intuitions of the Mind," &c. London: Macmillan and Co. 1866.

philosophy, and he cannot do so without referring in detail to the particular arguments and propositions which he deems it essential to controvert. Dr. M'Cosh's "Examination" is intended, we are told, for a critique of Mr. Mill's Review of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy, so that we might expect a very pretty three-cornered duel; but Dr. M'Cosh's purpose is not by any means so much to rehabilitate Sir W. Hamilton, as to show the baselessness of Mr. Mill's system. His principal point of attack is Mr. Mill's definition of "matter, as a permanent possibility of sensation." Whether Mr. Mill, in putting forth this definition, purposely left a doctrine in provisional obscurity, we are unable to say, but he has certainly exposed himself to the charge of reducing the non-ego to a mere modification of the ego, and representing the external world as an illusion. If, indeed, it be an illusion, the process of the illusion should be pointed out. Vagaries in the reports of our senses—as to a particular colour or sound or form—do not suffice to invalidate the trustworthiness of the general and constant testimony that these reports come to us from without ourselves. They come to us more or less varied and distorted; in other words, our knowledge of the external world is relative. This relativity of our knowledge Dr. M'Cosh does not seem cordially to accept; indeed, he repudiates it; "there can be no proof advanced in its behalf—that is, to show that the mirror does not correctly reflect the object presented to it" (p. 231). And yet in the same breath he admits, "that human knowledge never comes up to the extent of things," and "that human knowledge is often partial—that is, is only partially correct, and may have error mixed up with it" (*ib.*);—that is to say, it is truth to us; but truth to us we may reasonably suppose is not truth to a dog, nor truth to an angel, if angels there be.

As we are going to press we receive the pamphlet containing correspondence between the Prelates of Canterbury, Cape Town, and Natal, with some observations, apparently by a legal hand.[15] The point to be noted is this: the Archbishop of Canterbury justifies his absolving the clergy of Natal from obedience to their bishop on the ground that *in his opinion*, the reasons assigned by the Bishop of Cape Town for his so-called deposition "would have sufficed for the ejection of an English clergyman from his cure." The compiler therefore contrasts in parallel columns the reasons so assigned by the Bishop of Cape Town, and shows them to be in direct antagonism to the decisions of the Court of Arches and Privy Council in the Gorham and Essays and Reviews cases.

We have also received at the same moment, from Natal, "a Letter" by the bishop, and several sermons.[16] His lordship is speaking out manfully, not confining himself to the Pentateuch or the Old Testament, but grappling also from time to time with the structure of the New Testament and the composition of the Creeds—meanwhile never losing sight of the essential practical Christian truths which it is his office to enforce. We do not doubt that, as a sufficient number of these addresses are thrown off, they will be collected for republication in England, and will become most useful among ministers of the newer schools of thought at home.

POLITICS, SOCIOLOGY, VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

If a virtue could be repented of, or candour in discussing a public interest regretted, Mr. Mill will-have abundant reason to wish he had been less plain-spoken in his chapter on the Suffrage, when he reads, if he should chance to do so, the use to which his admissions are put by Mr. Lorimer in his "Constitutionalism of the Future."[1] This book is a parody on plurality in voting, and makes a thing, in itself reasonable, ridiculous by the extent to which it is carried. Mr. Mill thinks, and few we imagine do otherwise who think at all, that in the present state of education in England the great majority of the population are put poorly prepared for the exercise of the suffrage. He also thinks that any *very* great extension of the suffrage would not merely redress the balance of political power in England, but definitively transfer it to the lower and middle classes, to make use of the vaguest and most misused expressions in the vocabulary of politics. That this would be the tendency of such a change cannot, of course, be disputed, and a certain section of modern political writers, who may be called the bastard-genteel school, have taken full advantage of the fact to contend that the tendency in question is irresistible. We have heard of Tower Hamletizing the constituencies until the term has become as offensive as a popular tune which has been in possession of the Italian organ-boys for a twelvemonth. Is it meant to be asserted by those who so constantly recur to this argument, that in England, of all countries in the world the upper classes would give up their political habits and relinquish their governing tendencies if only the task were made a little more difficult and distasteful to them? Do these so-called Conservative writers so judge the party whose advocates they profess to be? If so, the upper classes are much more respected by their adversaries than by those who publicly affect to write in their interests. If the gentry of England were indeed so superfine that a little closer contact with the vulgar and their

---

[15] "Letters from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Cape Town, and the Bishop of Natal. With some observations on the Archbishop's Reply to the Bishop of Natal." London: Trübner. 1866.

[16] "A Letter to the Members of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Diocese of Natal." By the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Natal. Pietermaritzburg: Davis and Sons. 1866.

"Sermons preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Peter's, Maritzburg." By the Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Natal. Nos. 1—9. The same.

[1] "The Constitutionalism of the Future." By J. Lorimer. Edinburgh: C. and A. Black. 1865.

interests would disgust them with the profession of politics, there might be some ground for this affected alarm, which is, in our opinion, entirely factitious and ungrounded. The liberal party at least think far too highly of the upper classes of this country to anticipate such a result, which would be out of harmony with both the history and character of the English gentry. England would indeed suffer from any change which would result in their relinquishing their political habits and influence. But we can imagine no change, however revolutionary, which would be accepted by them as a complete defeat, while such as have been as yet contemplated among us, aspire only to diminish a power which the advocates of those changes believe to be excessive. It is certainly a curious sign of the times when a Conservative, or, as he prefers to call himself, a Tory, like Mr. Lorimer, comes forward to advocate universal suffrage; but the safeguards by which he proposes to counteract its dreaded democratic results are still more curious. The argument from the Church Catechism, by which he recommends what he calls his scheme of dynamical representation, would be more decisive if men were in a political sense more agreed on the definition of who are those betters before whom they are enjoined to order themselves lowly and reverently. But to come to the scheme which we have called a parody on plural voting. It ought to be given in the author's own words, and we shall reprint the page in which he tabulates the results of his opinions:—

"(1.) An ordinary rough, who had no other qualification except that he was a British subject, labouring under no *dis*qualification, would thus have one vote. (2.) If he had attained the age of fifty-one, and could read and write, he would have five votes. (3.) If he got so far as to pass the second-class examination he would have nine votes. (4.) The graduate of a university, forty-one years of age, who had 500*l.* a year, and was a member of the bar, would have the following votes:—As a citizen, one; age and experience, two; property, three; education, four; profession, four.—Total, 14. (5.) The maximum attainable would be citizenship, one; age, three; ex.-M.P., three; 10,000*l.* a year, ten; university degree, four; profession, four.—Total, twenty-five."

This is dynamical representation! or, as Mr. Lorimer elsewhere calls it, the exhaustion of the social elements of the voter. It seems to us, however, to be much like the exhaustion aimed at by those who had the social superiority in the Middle Ages, when they put on their coats of mail before they turned out to fight those who had nothing but their natural courage to rely on. If every so-called social element is to be provided with extraneous means of self-defence, in addition to the power inherent in it, we may as well at once give up all ideas of progress, and subside into a quiet resignation to things as they are. For our own part, though the principle of plural voting is logically defensible, and has the authority of one from whom we differ with the greatest reluctance, we are very far from thinking it indispensable, while we despair of its introduction into the suffrage, even in the moderate form in which it would be tolerable. The influence of wealth and station in England is already so great, that, as a practical measure, it seems quite unnecessary to increase it. The progress of education in the country, however short of what is to be desired, is yet made manifest even in this very question of Parliamentary Reform, by the calm tone of the public mind, and by the general wish that all proposals should have a fair hearing, and the best be acceded to. It is not likely that those classes which at present possess the greatest share of political influence in England will have it taken out of their hands by the present generation, if they choose to defend their position by reason and their projects by argument; while every succeeding generation, it is to be hoped and confidently expected, will be more and more open to appeals to that tribunal. The liberal party, at any rate, do not despair of finding the best and ablest men of the country at the head of its affairs, and is least of all likely to deny that many such are to be found where they might naturally be expected, among those classes which have longest enjoyed power and influence, and whose passive resignation of that influence, under any circumstances, is as inconceivable to their adversaries as it would be disastrous to their country. When a Conservative concedes universal suffrage under any conditions whatever, it can hardly be said that it is consolatory to find him entertaining any other liberal opinions; but we are glad to remark that it appears to Mr. Lorimer, "so far as he can pretend to have an opinion on the subject, that Mr. Hare's scheme for collecting the suffrages of the community would be a very great improvement on that at present in use, and would completely obviate the great injustice which the non-representation of minorities unquestionably occasions." It is, however, somewhat amusing to observe the diffidence with which he puts forth his pretensions to an opinion which is at least as well founded as any other in his volume. But perhaps the social element, which together with every other at present existing, ought in his opinion to be dynamically represented, is the power of a local landlord in a poor borough of five hundred constituents. At any rate, let this diffidence arise from what it may, it cannot be traced to any uncertainty about the nature and consequences of the system of voting advocated by Mr. Hare; and we rejoice in this instance, as in every other, to find the growing influence of one of the most practically important suggestions of modern politics. The simple artifice by which this scheme has been decried as complicated and incomprehensible, is becoming too transparent much longer to disguise the repugnance which is felt to that relinquishment of nine-tenths of the improper and indirect influences which infect our present system, to which its adoption would put an end.

Mr. Buxton's "Ideas of the Day on Policy,"[1] is very far from being one of its worst ideas.

[1] "The Ideas of the Day on Policy." By Chas. Buxton, M.A., M.P. London: J. Murray. 1866.

It consists of a careful selection of the chief arguments relied upon by the opposing parties in almost every question at present discussed among us that does not bear on dogmatic theology. The method adopted is that recommended and exemplified by Lord Bacon, in his "Colours of Good and Evil," and marshals in opposing columns the pleas brought forward by Tories on the one side and by Liberals on the other. It might be called a specimen of political book-keeping, in which every question is debited and credited, with the intellectual assets at its disposition. It is manifest that the book-keeper in such a case must be beyond suspicion, and we think we cannot give higher praise to Mr. Buxton than by the expression of our conviction that the most diligent search will not discover a false entry. The convenience of rapidly overlooking what has been said upon any subject which has been for some time under public discussion, is too great to escape the most careless, and will not be despised by the most painstaking. The candour and love of fair play which are manifest in every page of this little book, give great effect to a general criticism on the temper and character of the House of Commons which is not very likely to increase Mr. Buxton's popularity with his fellow-members. "Most Members of Parliament," he says, "care little for its politics, but look upon the House of Commons as an agreeable lounge; a large number, again, take a lively interest in Parliament as the scene of party conflicts, but the idea never crosses their mind of thinking for themselves, or taking a line of their own, on the questions of the day, and they look with wondering disgust on those who do." Mr. Buxton hardly seems to think that the atmosphere of the House is compatible with any higher aims. This, however, can only be the case when the higher aim is clogged with aspirations to place or office, which, being the accidents of party, must be bought by partisanship. There is nothing to prevent the greatest crotchet-monger in Parliament doing good service to his countrymen, if only his intellect be equal to his crotchets.

M. Stapleton's volume on "Intervention and Non-intervention,"[3] in spite of its general title, is nothing more than a violent attack on the foreign policy of the late premier, whom he accuses of degrading England from the position of the most universally trusted to that of the most suspected country in Europe. He does not stop short of the conclusion that England, when under the government of the Whigs, has done all in her power to produce that prejudice in the minds of continental Europeans which is expressed in the phrase *perfide Albion*. It is somewhat strange, at first sight, that the liberal party among us should have to answer such a charge, but the reasons which give a colourable pretext for the accusation are not far to seek. International law, except in so far as it may be deduced from existing treaties, and based on positive contract, has no existence, as law, in any proper sense of the term; it cannot rise above the authority of a prevalent opinion, and in this it exactly corresponds with those notions of good manners which were general in Europe when most of its maxims were first formulated, while its only sanction is drawn from the possibility that any infraction of its maxims would be punished like offences against good manners, by the swords which those who appealed to both then wore at their sides. A law thus dependent on opinion for its ultimate efficiency, is as little durable in any of its positive rules as the opinion on which it rests. Since the French Revolution the maxims of international law have had to accommodate themselves to the wishes and aspirations of the various populations of Europe, as well as to embody the conventional arrangements made by their rulers. Among a number of states governed on like principles such arrangements might long remain undisturbed, but as soon as the principles of arbitrary government and representative institutions were involved in national conflicts, it was not to be expected they could any longer answer this purpose. There is a certain insincerity in speaking, as Mr. Stapleton does, of rules laid down to preserve the balance of power in Europe as founded on the principle of non-intervention. The rules of international law, which have been founded on dynastic interests, cannot be expected to suffice in cases where something more and more important than territorial aggrandizement is at stake. Had it not been for the Holy Alliance, Lord Palmerston's policy would never have come to the birth as the natural antithesis to its plans and purposes. Non-intervention does not mean complete indifference. It would otherwise disarm its adherents for every purpose but that of self-defence, and be the grave of every international sympathy. It is this sympathy with the aims of the liberal party in Europe which really exposes Lord Palmerston to the adverse criticisms of Mr. Stapleton, which are too continuous to be candid, and too comprehensive to be true. No case whatever in which England has differed with any nation is too trifling for the notice of this hearty hater. In India and on the China seas we have behaved ourselves, in Mr. Stapleton's opinion, little better than robbers and smugglers. He thinks it quite unnecessary to discuss the question how far it is possible to conduct the national affairs of a civilized country with relatively barbarous ones, and yet maintain our sense of national dignity intact under their views of the conditions of our mutual intercourse. Law, as such, can only maintain itself among the likeminded. In these cases there is no community of opinion between the parties on which international relations can be securely founded, but a constant dissonance, which necessarily breaks out from time to time in appeals to force: a school which, however it may be despised, is that in which alone the law of nations has been formed in Europe.

M. Michelet has recently published a new edition of his Essay on the Working Classes,[4]

[3] "Intervention and Non-intervention." By A. G. Stapleton. London: J. Murray. 1866.

[4] "Le Peuple." Par J. Michelet. Paris: Charmerot and Co. London: D. Nutt. 1866.

written in 1846, many passages in which have become classical from the loving sympathy by which they are inspired. The whole book is an eloquent apology for the faults, and an enthusiastic eulogy of the virtues of those it describes. There is something more than the insight of a poetical imagination in the pictures he draws of French peasants and operatives. It is, however, not to be disguised that the engaging features of this flattering likeness are taken from the feelings and sentiments rather than from the thoughts and views of the class. Those passages in the dedication of the first edition to M. Edgar Quinet, in which he gives such interesting autobiographical details of his own youth, are not likely to be soon forgotten by any one who has ever read them, while the indignant protest he makes in the same place against those French novelists who, describing almost exclusively the vices of Parisian society, give up their country to the scorn of foreigners, may be taken as the keynote of the better and more comprehensive view which he so eloquently sets forth. Full of that insight which sympathy alone can give, the volume is equally distinguished by those artistic exaggerations for which its author is so remarkable. None of the noble qualities he finds in the working classes can be for one moment disputed; they are for the most part such as are the natural growth of the circumstances in which they are placed, and are full of touching poetry as conceived by him. But is there any class whatever not susceptible of a poetical transfiguration, if the fitting poet be ready with his song? It is very natural that in any such case the poet should become so enamoured of his subject as to attribute to it all beauty and excellence in terms which almost imply that it has the monopoly of them. But every one knows that M. Michelet writes like a lover; and though he for the moment carries away his readers, and warms them by an enthusiasm too rare not to be delightful, we are afraid that he has never taken sufficient security against the reaction to his excitement by a calm summary of—what, then, shall be done?

Another book on the same subject, or rather on the political capacity of the same class,[8] by an equally decided, but we fear not so disinterested a partisan of their rights, affords a curious contrast to the above in tone, method, and result. While Michelet is full of their past history and present condition, Proudhon is concerned only with their future, and is not very far from despising the working classes of France, because they are, as a body, unprepared to accept his views of that future. All hope of sympathy between the different classes of society he manifestly looks upon as Utopian and misleading. He divides class from class, that the lowest of all may become a political instrument in the hands of those who espouse their special interests, which he maintains can never meet with their just acknowledgment, until, by a strict and exclusive organization, they make the power of their weight and numbers felt and attended to.

"But what is to be done," he says, "with people who have no distinct notion of their own political position or rights, and have done nothing but shout '*Vive l'Empereur*' or '*Vive le Roi*,' or '*Vive Monseigneur*' or '*Vive notre maitre*;' who have abolished all things and founded nothing; who love military glory, and prefer animal courage to intellect; whose views of foreign politics are always clouded by passion; who exaggerate every national vanity and pretension, and forget every really French interest; who adore rhetoric, who admire orators; who cannot reason; speeches that come to no conclusion; images rather than ideas; and phrases more than arguments; who are the dupes of every affected sentiment, and are incapable of detecting the grossest charlatanism; who insist on being flattered and courted; who are passionately attached to show and magnificence, to uniforms and embroidery; who desire an expensive government, and think that luxury their own because they pay for it; and yet, though proud and haughty as a body, are not too much so as individuals to ask for 'something in' when they are paid the promised price for work done; who, if they are domestics, will either take a commission from their employer's tradespeople, or pilfer from what is entrusted to their care; who, if coachmen, waiters, porters, cabmen, to say nothing of a host of others, must 'always ask for something to drink—what is to be done with such a people as this? indignantly exclaims that would-be tribune. What is the use of universal suffrage to a class that, when they are justly paid what is their due, are not satisfied unless they get some *douceur* in excess of the terms of their contract?"

And yet these two pictures of the same class in the same country are far from inconsistent with one another; they are but the views of it from without, the basis and surface of class character, so far as any such generalizations are true at all. It is clear that Proudhon could not possibly have supposed that all the vices he lays to the charge of the working classes could be overcome and forgotten in time for their next opportunity, which he announced for 1869; when, if they would take his advice, and in the interval reform themselves, they would have their chance of striking for a system of mutuality and reciprocal assurance, of decentralization and federal government, which would inaugurate the long-expected reign of social happiness and justice, and France and Frenchmen be happy by his means. Is it worth while making the obvious reflection suggested by every page of these two books?—that classes of society are kept asunder by their vices, and brought together, if at all, by those virtues which have a deeper source than their political relations to each other.

Mr. Watts's "Facts of the Cotton Famine"[9] is much more than a mere history of the calamity it describes. It is nothing less than a philosophical description of the most intelligent, and because the most intelligent, the most interesting section of English operatives. In its first character, as a history of the years of distress, it is complete, full, and satisfactory, bristling with figures and statistical re-

[8] "De la Capacité Politique des Classes Ouvrières." Par P. J. Proudhon. Paris: E. Dentu. London: D. Nutt. 1865.

[9] "The Facts of the Cotton Famine." By John Watts, Ph. D., Member of the Central Relief Committee. London: Simpkin, Marshall and Co. 1866.

turns, but oppressed by neither, admirable in the arrangement of the subject, and exhaustive of all its details. In its second character, which rather animates the treatment of the subject than obtrudes itself in any dogmatic manner, it is a complete sociological study of the moral and intellectual effects of the great development of human labour which machinery and subdivision have brought about in Lancashire. As a history, this volume will always be a storehouse of well-arranged facts on one of the most important crises in modern industry, while the views it constantly brings forward on the influence exerted by capital on the character of the labourer, belong to an order of thought that has few such intelligent representatives. The Lancashire operatives have been admired and very justly praised for the spirit of patient endurance displayed under the severe trial from which they are but just emerging. The admiration and praise have been nobly earned and ungrudgingly given, but few have thought it worth while to inquire in what school these virtues were acquired, and how it came about that the children of a class the most disorderly, violent, and uncontrollable, have displayed, under circumstances of exceptional trial, qualities the very reverse of those which characterized their immediate progenitors. And yet the question is one well worth discussion. In a formal manner it is never brought forward by Mr. Watts, but few candid readers can lay down his book without feeling that the answer it conveys is as conclusive as it is satisfactory. The habits of order and regularity which are indispensably necessary to the pecuniary success of a large and complicated industrial undertaking, necessarily react upon every one who takes a part, however subordinate, in its processes. A man who has all his life been employed upon some small and restricted process, which, although almost hidden in, is still necessary to the result in which it can scarcely be recognised, is naturally led to feel, if not to reflect, that he occupies in the great society of men a similar position, and that the mechanism of social life is as dependent upon regularity and order as the material fabric to which he supplies so small a part of its ultimate appearance. This education which capital gives to labour it is not fashionable to acknowledge, in spite of the overwhelming evidence of its force which has been displayed during the last few years in the north of England. It is an education, too, which is given almost unconsciously, and in this resembles the manner in which some of our strongest principles and prejudices are implanted in us. This is the moral side of the pursuit of wealth, which has been far too little dwelt upon by economists, and which would well repay a full and thorough exposition, but which is of course quite incompatible with the limits at our present disposal. There are one or two popular prejudices about the cotton hands which are thoroughly dispelled by Mr. Watts. It has been said that the high temperature of the working-rooms in the mills, and the consequent early puberty of those employed in them, were highly conducive to sexual immorality. A comparison of the judicial statistics on this subject shows, that when compared with the rest of the kingdom, Lancashire illegitimacy is only 0·28 per cent. above the average of the whole of England and Wales. The per centage of bastardy in Lancashire is 7·27, while in Monmouth and Wales it is 7·3; in the North-Western Counties, 7·4; in Yorkshire, 7·6; in the Northern Counties, 7·8; and in the North Midland Counties, 8·8. These figures, which are largely in excess of the corresponding ones for the Southern Counties, point rather to better wages and greater independence than to any effect traceable to the general character of manufacturing as opposed to agricultural employment. Another curious feature of Lancashire morality may be traced to the same source. The per-centage of female crimininality exhibits a most remarkable difference from that which prevails in other parts of the country. From 1851 to 1855 the proportion was 27·8 for England and Wales, against 35·9 for Lancashire, and from 1856 to 1860 it was 28·3 to 40·72. This is very striking, but is directly traceable to the greater independence of women in the manufacturing districts. Mr. Watts asks the very pertinent question, "Can it be possible that progress towards the independence of women would develope vice as well as virtue, and that to render woman equal to man in power would also render her his equal in crime?" This is a question seldom fairly looked at by the advocates of woman's rights, but cannot be shirked by those who desire and advocate their extension. There is nothing alarming in the apparent answer. A virtue that is not the result of an intelligent choice has none of the positive qualities which make virtue desirable. Liberty and self-determination are not only desirable in themselves, but they are certainly the only sources from which the highest good can ultimately be drawn for the society in which they are possible. When these are once acquired, every man and woman goes to the great school of nature and takes the correction which her laws unflinchingly administer for their own benefit and that of their fellows. The lessons taught in this school are likely, when once there is a free access to it, to work as great a change upon mankind, as, in a more restricted sphere, the influences of capital have upon the rough and passionate nature of the Lancashire lads and lasses of the past generation. These two instances will suffice to show to what apparently remote results Mr. Watts pushes his comprehensive inquiry. It is quite impossible here to touch upon the history of the administration of the relief afforded by the Government and nation—upon the sad consequences of the famine to the most deserving of the population—upon the full history of the rise, progress, and terrible crisis of the cotton manufacture; there is, however, nothing that we can remember as characteristic of the attitude of either the operatives or the nation which escapes his notice, and for the most part his judicious comment. This volume is a complete encyclopædia for reference on the subject, and the large and comprehensive views of the author will make it welcome wherever the modern spirit of industrialism has to be studied or discussed.

Those who take up Mr. Ellis's "Thoughts on

the Future of the Human Race"[7] in search of predictions or forecasts of the future, will be grievously disappointed; unless, indeed, his solitary prognostication, that "progressive improvement is inevitable," should strike them as a novelty. His title-page would justify many in expecting some nearer approach to a definite exposition of possible events than he has undertaken or thinks justifiable. It is no doubt indisputably true that our power of anticipating coming events is in direct proportion to our knowledge and comprehension of the past and present; but a lengthened exhortation to acquire that knowledge and insight, is hardly entitled to be called a treatise on the future of the human race. Perhaps there never was a time, unless in the latter half of the 16th century, when men were less inclined to doubt the general progress of their race than they are at present. The history of the last half century in Western Europe and America is a continued protest against the statu-quo-ite and deteriorationist. Mr. Ellis, it seems to us, is fighting with an imaginary adversary, and indeed, is constantly obliged to set him on his legs, that he may deliver his blows at him; this he does with infinite art and deliberation, but with a tediousness of repetition that becomes after the first chapter or two positively wearisome. As a very general picture of the progress made in material wealth, of a growing sympathy and enlarged sense of duty among us, there are many excellent, though laborious passages in this volume, which are manifest evidence that his conclusion has been long since too fully accepted and acted on to stand in need of such an elaborate proof. That we are better off than our ancestors few will dispute. but in what way our children's condition will be an advance upon our own, is a subject of inquiry which is only fruitful when accompanied by practical suggestions for insuring more definite results than can be summarized under the vague assurance of general improvement.

A volume by Professor Arnold of Marburg, on Civilization and Jurisprudence,[8] is the first of four, in which he intends to discuss the influence which each exerts on the other. The present one is confined to the general effects of the economical condition, common law, and political institutions of any country on its systematic jurisprudence. In the second he promises to treat of the Roman system, as it existed in antiquity; in the third, he will take up the elements of law, as they existed among the German races before they were affected by the introduction of principles derived from the former; and in the fourth volume he hopes to show by a history of that introduction the modifications which each have undergone. The general subject is co-extensive with the moral and intellectual history of mankind, and will be the last expression of human knowledge when once its generalizations have been made with a convincing truth. Professor Arnold is far from supposing that we are in a position soon to arrive at such results, but is satisfied, as he says, with carrying another stone to the great edifice. The present volume is sober, clear, and most accessibly written, with a complete absence of those technical expressions which debar a layman from taking up a book any way connected with law or jurisprudence.

M. About, who some time since paid homage to the rising sun of political economy in his *Progrès*, repeats his reverence in a little volume on Life Insurance,[9] in which, after an interchange of compliments between himself and M. Eugène Reboul, he steps forward as the champion of a cause that wants no supporters in England, whatever it may do in France. The arguments of his *brochure* can be found in a condensed form in any prospectus of an English insurance office. It is true that they are not there illustrated by epigrams, or by any logic but that of facts; but if the logic of his exposition is good, as much cannot be said for its taste, which is simply execrable. This will not surprise the readers of *Madelon* and *La Vielle Roche*. That we may not be thought prejudiced, we translate a portion of his argument to prove the prudence of the practice of Life Insurance:—

"We will suppose an upper clerk in trade, commerce, or banking, let him be, in fact, anything you please—a manager, or a very precocious *préfet*, who is thirty years of age; in or out of uniform, this young man earns, we will say, 20,000fr. per annum. If he were immortal, and could preserve his youth like the gods of Olympus, the firm which he carries on his shoulders would represent a capital of at least 800,000fr. (we might say 400,000fr. if a man were not a kind of sunken capital which perishes day by day); the misfortune is, that he may tumble downstairs and break his neck, and then his jolly capital would not be worth 60fr., the price of a dead horse. The best and most beautiful of men, when he is once dead, is, in fact, worth considerably less than nothing. His body not only represents no appreciable value, but puts his heirs to expense. His funeral, the purchase of a piece of ground, the cost of the most moderate mourning; just add all this together, and you will appreciate the entirely negative value of the human carcass."

This choice specimen of modern French sentiment is by no means an isolated one in the little volume from which it is taken; but we suppose that M. About knows his public. All we can say is, that we hope he is deceived in the judgment he has evidently formed of it. To say that his *brochure* is clear, terse, witty, and to the point, is almost superfluous; these things every one has a right to expect at his hands. It is impossible to deny that the cause he advocates is a good one; but this is in itself so palpable that nothing remains open to criticism except the manner in which he manages his weapons, and of this we think we have said enough by quoting his own words as above.

Mr. Barnum's "Humbugs of the World"[10] is

[7] "Thoughts on the Future of the Human Race." By W. Ellis. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1866.

[8] "Cultur und Rechtsleben." Von W. Arnold. Berlin: F. Dümmler. London: D. Nutt. 1865.

[9] "L'Assurance." Par E. About. Paris: Hachette and Co. London: D. Nutt. 1866.

[10] "The Humbugs of the World." By P. T. Barnum. London: J. C. Hotten. 1866.

a trashy compilation, as miscellaneous in its contents as his own museum. Its title is an advertisement which cannot be justified even on his own principle, that at least something like money's worth should be given to those whose curiosity is excited by it. The only original part consists of a collection of letters and evidence, exposing mediums and spirit-rapping. His wrath burns very fiercely against the Davenport brothers, and his demolition of their pretences will be perfectly satisfactory to those who never gave credence to them, but is likely to have but small effect on believing spiritualists. In this he is not to be blamed. Argument is thrown away on those who have other avenues to knowledge besides the five senses. Perhaps, too, there is something of the *jalousie du métier* in his onslaught. In a chapter on hoaxes, he gives the history of the pamphlet on miscegenation, and in another on ghosts, tells a good story of Cuvier (we suppose any other naturalist would have done as well). "Some one undertook to scare him with a ghost having an ox's head; Cuvier awoke and found the fearful thing grinning and glaring at his bedside. 'What do you want?' 'To devour you!' growled the ghost. 'Devour me!' quoth the great Frenchman. 'Hoofs, horns, graminivorous! you can't do it! Clear out!'" There are some half-dozen stories as good as this to be found in the volume, as there were some things of interest in his museum, but if it had been half as laborious to walk through the museum as we have found it to wade through his book, all his skill in advertising could not have kept it open for so many years.

Mr. Sala's "Trip to Barbary by a Roundabout Route,"[11] is a collection of the "correspondence" he sent home when he followed the French Emperor into Algiers in the character of comic chorus. He confesses that his object is, in the first place, to amuse, and the reader must be hard to please who cannot find amusement in his pages. An entertainment of a similar kind is often to be met with in country fairs at a cart's-tail, but is of a sort that is much more adapted to single letters than to a continuous series. To be kept on the broad grin for more than five minutes at a time is a little exhausting; but it is as useless to put on airs of gravity with Mr. Sala, as it would be with the ingenious gentleman with whom we have irreverently compared him, and who would be certain to dispel any such protest by a knowing wink, or by thrusting his tongue in his cheek. At the very outset of his journey, the author introduces himself, or rather presents himself as introduced by those he calls his proprietors, to the new King Public, apparently with the full conviction that the modern potentate must stand in need of an officer who was seldom wanting in the early courts of those other kings on whom he turns his back. The officer in question, though profanely called so, was seldom the greatest fool about the court. He knew the foibles of his master, and of those who surrounded him, and fully resolving to make profit of both, assumed a latitude in particular satire, on the understanding that the favourite weaknesses of his majesty were rather to be flattered than exposed. Mr. Sala has a full knowledge of his position, and takes cares that the pet notions of the new monarch shall be tenderly treated. But we are dropping into the attitude which we have said was so untenable in the presence of his irresistible literary patter, and shall only suggest that if it was worth while to collect these letters, the numerous traces of the hurry and difficulty under which they were written should have been better effaced on their leisurely republication. To compare himself to Sir John instead of Hamlet, because he is "fat and scant of breath," may be excused when a man is writing on the top of his hat in a hurry to catch the post, but ought not to remain on revision; and the same may be said of the excuse he finds for the ungallant remarks of Torquato Tasso, or as he prefers to style him, Signor T. T., that it was in the *fourteenth* century he wrote of Algiers as an infamous den of pirates and nursing mother of lions and elephants. All dimensions and distances are given in the terms of the most approved French guide-book, on an assumption far too flattering to most Englishmen, who, however conversant with the language, have in general but vague notions connected with litres, hectares, and metres. But this is useless; the book is intended to amuse, and fulfils its purpose with an animation and unflagging spirit and courage which must be the admiration, and excite the envy of Special Correspondents in every quarter of the world. It is folly to quarrel with Wamba because he is not so gravely sententious as would become the Abbot of Jorvaulx.

The "Red Shirt," by Alberto Mario,[12] is very properly called episodes, for it is in no sense a history of the remarkable enterprise in which he took part; but it gives, what few histories do, the clearest insight into the animus which prevailed among the better part of that strangely adventurous band. The enthusiasm, audacity, and moral exaltation which for a time set at naught every calculation of ordinary prudence, are reflected in every page of this narrative. At the same time it seems evident that no community could long maintain itself in such a state of tension, and that the common influences of the work-a-day world were not at all premature in associating themselves with a movement radically incapable of a prolonged extension. These episodes are as interesting as a novel, the incidents are as romantic as could be invented by the liveliest imagination, and yet they are as true as the most every-day facts. One of the least important in itself, but the most illustrative of the state of Neapolitan life, is the curious chapter devoted to the author's mission of Forio d'Ischia. It is the story of the Capulets and Montagus in the nineteenth century, with a dash of modern intrigue to reconcile itself with cotemporary politics, but with a happier conclusion. We must,

[11] "A Trip to Barbary by a Roundabout Route." By G. A. Sala. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1866.

[12] "The Red Shirt." By Alberto Mario. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

however, confess that we should fear the ghosts of private feuds that are only buried under the momentary enthusiasm of a freshly recovered public liberty. That Signor Mario should look upon the arrival of Victor Emmanuel at Gaëta as the frustration of a glorious enterprise, is but natural. It may, however, be seen, even in his own pages, that the irresistible *élan* of the first attack had been already weakened by the intrusion into Garibaldi's force of elements very different from those to which he owed his wonderful success. Such violent births are of but poor validity. It is one of the rarest of mental phenomena when individual men are regenerated in a single day; but no national life can thus turn back upon itself. A collective interest must have firmer and more durable bases than are to be found in an emotional condition, however noble in itself.

Some of the naval and military trials recounted by Mr. Burke[13] hardly deserve to be so called, as for instance that of Jack the Painter, for the destruction of part of the dockyard at Portsmouth, in 1776, and the trial of General Sir Robert Wilson and others, in France, for aiding in the escape of Lavallette. Indeed, it would seem that if the person indicated was either sailor or soldier, it is sufficient, in Mr. Burke's opinion, to make the trial a naval or military one. Thus, in the case of Governor Wall, and in that of Colonel Despard, the murder and treason for which they respectively suffered, came under the cognizance of the civil tribunal. The volume, however, is interesting, and although the author's criticisms throughout are of a very commonplace character, he has been at considerable trouble in very fully reporting the proceedings in each case, so that a great amount of local colour and cotemporary feeling is reflected in his pages. In addition to those we have mentioned, the volume contains the trials of Benbow's captains, of Captain Kidd the pirate, of Admiral Byng, Lord George Sackville, of Admiral Keppel, and Vice-Admiral Calder, with an account of the mutinies at the Nore and on board the *Bounty*.

The first part of a very full and handsome gazetteer of England and Wales has just been issued by Messrs. Fullarton & Co.,[14] which from its completeness promises to supersede all others. Some idea may be formed of the magnitude of the undertaking from the fact that the first four hundred pages do not get beyond the first half of the letter C. It is copiously illustrated by maps and plans of all the cities, towns, estuaries, and harbours, and is to be accompanied by a map of the whole country, carefully reduced from those of the Ordnance survey.

Mr. Charles Brooke's "Ten Years in Sarawak,"[15] is tedious from the monotony of his constant conflicts with the unsubdued tribes round that settlement, but it is valuable for its sincerity and the manifest reliableness of the picture which he draws of the slow progress by which a wild and semi-savage race can be made amenable to the rules of a more civilized life. As a history of English administration it will no doubt be exposed to the cavils of those who think that the law need not always precede the gospel, or that what is good for the sixth form is equally so for the first. The violent proceedings and drastic measures by which every valuable advance has been hitherto brought about in all societies, are too apt to be forgotten by those who have outgrown the necessity for their use. Mr. Brooke's accounts of his perilous and adventurous journeys up the rapid and dangerous rivers of the country, for the purpose of suppressing the head-hunting propensities of the natives or of securing the peace and order of the seaboard communities, are told with a graphic power and vividness that are the more impressive from the absence of all attempts at dramatic completeness or exaggeration of the effect produced by them. Nothing but a strong conviction of the ultimate good which must ensue from their exertions could support a few Europeans under the wearisome uniformity and constant dangers of a life among the Dyaks, who are like grown-up children, liable to the most outrageous bursts of passion, but impressionable and ultimately amenable to a strict rule at the hands of those they respect and love. The richness and fertility of this great island imply a future of proportionate wealth and influence, and one of the best features of Mr. Brooke's book, as it is also one of the rarest qualities in those who are heartily interested in their subject, is the sobriety with which he argues such questions as are connected with the physical improvement of the race, the prospects of Christianity among them, and the influence of Malay Mahommedanism and Chinese industrialism. Altogether the book is a valuable addition to our knowledge of that curious episode in modern history which may be called the "Brookes in Borneo."

"Cast Away on the Auckland Isles,"[16] is one of the most interesting histories of shipwreck and courageous endurance that is anywhere to be met with. The schooner *Grafton*, Capt. Musgrave, was wrecked in the southern harbour of these Islands on the 3rd January, 1864. After enduring the greatest physical hardships and the sickness of twenty months deferred hope that he and his few companions might be picked up by some whaling ship calling at the Islands, Capt. Musgrave, with the help of his able mate Raynal, converted the old and shattered dingy, which had been preserved from the wreck, into a sea-going boat in which he and two of the party ventured on a voyage of 250 miles to Stewart's Island, the southern point of New Zealand, and accomplished the daring feat in five days. In spite of his exhaustion and suffering, he, aided by Mr. John Macpherson of Invercargill, immediately returned in the *Flying Scud*, and brought off the two sail-

[13] "Celebrated Naval and Military Trials." By Peter Burke. London: W. H. Allen and Co. 1866.

[14] "The Imperial Gazetteer of England and Wales." Edinburgh: A. Fullarton and Co.

[15] "Ten Years in Sarawak." By Charles Brooke. 2 vols. Tinsley Brothers. 1866.

[16] "Cast away on the Auckland Isles." From the journal of Captain Thomas Musgrave. London: Lockwood and Co. 1866.

ors who had been left behind. For all that is implied in this short summary we must refer to Capt. Musgrave's pages, which are full of interest and information. These islands were first discovered in 1806, and have been visited by Capt. Ross, Admiral Dumont D'Urville, and Capt. Wilkes of the United States. From their accounts it might be supposed they were rather desirable places than otherwise, and indeed there was an effort made, but with little success, by Mr. Enderby, about 1850, to establish a depot on the most northerly island, which might become a rendezvous for the southern whale fishery. But the facts of the case are manifestly very different from the views of the first visitors to these islands. Capt. Musgrave preserved his own life and those of his crew only by the fortunate chance that he was cast away in the southern harbour, for while he was on the island, the *Invercauld*, with a crew of twenty-five men, was wrecked on the north-west coast, and though nineteen succeeded in reaching land, they all perished from starvation with the exception of the captain, mate, and one boy, who, after a year's detention on the island, were picked up by a Portuguese vessel which sent a boat ashore to see if assistance could be found on the island to enable its crew to repair a leak in their ship. That two crews should thus at one time, in ignorance of one another's existence, be wandering about an island which is not thirty miles long in its greatest extent, speaks volumes for the inaccessible nature of the country. Had it not been for the seals which frequent the southern harbour in great numbers, the crew of the *Grafton* must have shared the fate of the majority of that of the *Invercauld*. But even this resource might have failed them another year, for while on their arrival the "mobs" of seals hardly resisted or avoided the attacks made on them, they had become so wary before Captain Musgrave left, that he and his companions were but too happy to put up with any old sea monster they could capture, instead of feeding, as they did at first, exclusively on delicate yearling calves. This is a delicacy, however, to which few of us would wish to be restricted. The account of the lengthening and fitting up of the dingy, without a nail which they had not first made with old iron from the wreck, nor any tools but one axe, an adze, and a gimlet—is an example of patient courage and endurance that throws into the shade the most imaginative fiction. But must not always great things be done before they can be imagined as credible? Not only in the supreme effort to escape which had such well-deserved success is this narrative remarkable, but also for the resolute order of life established among the little company, for the constant industry with which the harbours were surveyed, barometrical and other observations made during their stay, for the means by which the minds of all were kept actively employed, and for the unconscious evidence it displays of talents for command and government in its author, which have been rarely excelled.

"Memorials of Service in India,"[17] have been given to the public by the late Major Macpherson's brother with a twofold object: first, to place on record the very important services rendered to the Indian Government by an able and talented officer; and next, with a fraternal desire to vindicate that officer's posthumous fame from the unfair aspersions cast upon it by Major-General John Campbell, in a volume published in 1864 ("A Personal Narrative of Services among the Wild Tribes of Khondistan.") It appears that both officers were employed, though at different periods, in suppressing, among a wild people called Khonds, the rite of human sacrifice and the practice of infanticide. Each officer claims the sole merit of having effected this object, and General Campbell has had the advantage of being the first in the field to put publicly forward his pretensions. Both officers in describing their operations go over nearly the same ground, but Major Macpherson is much more minute in his description of the Khond habits and customs, and his full and lucid account of the mythological creed (discredited by Gen. Campbell) and social organization of this singular race, will render his book the more acceptable of the two to the ethnologist. The two officers differed so far in the policy they pursued, that while Gen. Campbell added physical to moral force, Major Macpherson trusted to conciliatory measures only, paving the way to religious change by an acceptable civil administration; and there can be no doubt that his policy met with the more unqualified approbation of the Government of India and the Court of Directors, for the latter have placed on record that the merit of having extinguished the horrid rite of human sacrifice is due to Major Macpherson alone; and this verdict we are inclined to endorse on reading the account of his subsequent successful diplomacy at the court of Gwalior, to which (after a short residence in a similar capacity at Bhopal) he was, in 1854, appointed political agent. Here his admirable power of individual character soon gained him a firm ally in the famous Dewan Dinkur Rao, the *de facto* ruler of the state, and to this sagacious alliance it may be fairly attributed that we had not arrayed against us in 1857 the whole of Upper and perhaps of the South of India, and that for the four most critical months of the rebellion, when the fate of Agra and Delhi hung in the balance, 16,000 of perhaps the best native troops in India were kept from joining the rebels. No one at all acquainted with the native character will fail to appreciate the difficulties of Major Macpherson's position, or the statesmanship he exhibited in surmounting them; and the editor of this highly interesting volume, far from overrating either, has told his tale with modesty, candour, and marked ability.

In the story of the Dooar war[18] we have a

[17] "Memorials of Service in India." From the correspondence of the late Major Samuel Macpherson, C.B., political agent at Gwalior during the mutiny, and formerly employed in the suppression of human sacrifices in Orissa. Edited by his brother, W. Macpherson. London: John Murray. 1865.

[18] "Bhotan, and the Story of the Dooar War, in-

connected narrative of the causes, the prosecution, and the effects of the hostilities in which, for the last two years, the Bengal Government have been engaged on their north-eastern frontier. It appears that in 1863, it being thought desirable that our relations with the Bhotan Government should be placed on a more distinctly defined and friendly footing, a mission to effect that object was, early in 1864, despatched to the Bhotan capital under the leadership of the Hon. Ashley Eden, a Bengal civilian. Mr. Eden was furnished with the draft of a treaty, by which reciprocal concessions were to be made with regard to certain border raids recently engaged in by the subjects of both Governments, and if possible, clauses regarding the condition of criminals, free trade, and protection to travellers were to be agreed upon. The mission, notwithstanding many obstacles purposely thrown in its way, eventually reached the capital, Poonakha, where it was received with gross indignities, and, after being forcibly detained for a fortnight, was at length allowed to depart only on the condition of Mr. Eden signing an "agreement," by which a considerable tract of British territory was to be made over to Bhotan. It was therefore resolved to annex the Dooars, or country lying between the British frontier and the Bhotan hills, as well as a portion of the hill territory. As it was from these Dooars that Bhotan was supposed to draw its chief supply of the necessaries of life, it was presumed that this hostile occupation would bring the Bhotanese to terms. Accordingly columns of British troops crossed the frontier at four different points, and captured the stockades and forts commanding the hill passes, leaving garrisons in the principal positions. The main force then withdrew, but they had hardly reached their cantonments before the Bhotanese assumed the offensive, and succeeded in recapturing the fort of Dewangiri, the garrison abandoning in their retreat two Armstrong guns. Reinforcements were promptly despatched from Calcutta, and by April, 1865, the Bhotanese were completely driven out of the field and sued for peace. Dr. Rennie deserves much credit for the industry and care with which, from the verbiage of official despatches and correspondence, he has gathered the materials for this readable volume, and we should have little fault to find with the book were it not, like his previous works, overloaded with insipid strictures on matters concerning which few would feel inclined to accept him as an authority.

"Beaten Tracks,"[19] by the authoress of a "Voyage en Zigzag," is a bright, cheerful, and amusing series of letters describing a tour made last year through France and Lombardy to Florence, where the tourists were for some time detained by the illness of one of their party. There is a pleasing feminine tone of sentiment running through these letters, and a slight tendency to a fondling enthusiastic treatment of anything that particularly pleases their writer, who is, however, far too intelligent to be quite carried away by any temptations to exaggeration. The volume is profusely illustrated by a number of facile etchings, after drawings made by her of any object which struck her on the journey: they are in excellent harmony with the letters themselves, and display exactly that more than average accomplishment which speaks in every page of them. The whole correspondence is singularly natural and unpretending, and gives a very lively picture of such incidents as may be expected by any one who, in easy circumstances, and with a natural faculty of enjoyment, may feel inclined to follow in the steps of this well-described journey.

Another tour in Italy by Herr Max Nohl[20] is very well worth reading. The author was a rising German architect, who died in the summer of 1863. The present volume has been edited by a friend, Herr W. Lübke, who has prefaced it with a biography of the author. The chief purpose of the journey described was a professional one, and a great attraction of the volume consists in the numerous and clever sketches of the architectural peculiarities which struck Herr Nohl on his route, which, in spite of the minuteness of their scale, give an interest to his remarks that would otherwise be wanting to those who are unacquainted with the different styles prevalent in Italy.

Captain Osborne has collected in one volume his "Quedah," his "Cruise in Japanese Waters," and "The Fight on the Peiho in 1859."[21] The first of these is one of the best boy's books extant, as well as a first-rate picture of naval service in the Malayan Seas. The animated account of his youthful command on board the *Emerald* is not easily forgotten by those who have ever read it.

Dr. Macleod's account of his tour in Egypt and Syria,[22] reprinted from "Good Words," with copious illustrations, has a very handsome appearance, and will be very welcome to those who appreciate his mild clerical attempts at humour, or accept his principles of Biblical criticism, in neither of which classes can we affect to place ourselves.

SCIENCE.

Though Dr. Hofmann's lectures[1] were published

cluding Sketches of a Three Months' Residence at the Himalayas, and Narrative of a Visit to Bhotan in 1865." By D. F. Rennie, M.D., Surgeon 20th Hussars, author of "The British Arms in North China," &c. J. Murray. 1866.

[19] "Beaten Tracks; or Pen and Pencil Sketches in Italy." By the authoress of a "Voyage en Zigzag." London: Longmans and Co. 1866.

[20] "Tagebuch einer Italienischen Reise." Von Max Nohl. Stuttgart: Ebner and Seubert. London: Williams and Norgate. 1866.

[21] "Quedah; a Cruise in Japanese Waters; and the Fight on the Peiho." By Captain Osborne. London: Blackwood and Sons. 1865.

[22] "Eastward." By Norman Macleod, D.D., one of her Majesty's chaplains. London: A. Strahan. 1866.

[1] "Introduction to Modern Chemistry, Experi-

last year, we think no apology will be needed for noticing them here. The volume is well got up, and is illustrated by woodcuts taken from photographs of apparatus such as was actually employed in the lecture-room. Dr. Hofmann, by the aid of this apparatus, always simple and elegant, has contrived to illustrate the operation of those laws which are the foundations of chemistry. Granting that the experiments are accurately described, it is impossible to doubt any of the principles here enunciated. His experiments not only bring before the mind of the reader the peculiar characters of the elements, but also the laws of combination in definite proportion, with a clearness and beauty, rarely, if ever, previously attained. The book will be eminently valuable to chemists commencing their career as teachers. The language is very clear and simple, and the work contains nothing which any person of average intelligence could fail to understand, even if utterly unacquainted with chemistry.

When an attempt is made to introduce into a science a new system of nomenclature, we have a right to expect that this system should present some decided points of advantage over those already in use, and that the book introducing it should be carefully written and edited. Such, we regret to say, is not the case with Professor Williamson's "Chemistry for Students."[2] In the latter respect especially it is very deficient, many glaring errors being left uncorrected. For example, in paragraph 215, the word "lime" is substituted for "soda;" in consequence of which mistake the student is informed that he can obtain soda from two substances, neither of which contain any trace of sodium. This is by no means a solitary instance. The index, also, is very faulty, and the peculiar form of the book renders this defect of more than usual consequence. Many important substances treated of in the work are omitted—among others, tartaric and chloric acids. This is the more remarkable, as derivatives of tartaric acid are mentioned. Sugar is not to be found, nor is alcohol, except under its somewhat antiquated name of vinic alcohol; but under M there is "mixture of alcohol and water." As a book of reference, Professor Williamson's work is useless, partly because of the badness of the index, partly because the facts relating to any one particular substance are distributed in various parts of the book—a process being described in one place, and its rationale being considered elsewhere. We have no particular objection to the proposed new nomenclature, except that in the case of some of the more complicated substances it would result in names which even an experienced chemist would hardly understand, but it labours under the immense disadvantage of *being* a *new* nomenclature, and before its adoption, must prove its superiority to the old systems. We do not believe that it possesses such superiority, and indeed, cannot find that it is in any way better than the nomenclatures in use. What advantage, for example, is gained by calling tartrate of soda "sodic tartrate"? unless that the word *of* is omitted. On the other hand, it has certain disadvantages, particularly in the naming of the large class of salts of bibasic acids. Professor Williamson, however, is not inclined to apply the word *acid* at all to these compounds, and would call tartaric acid hydric tartrate, and sulphuric acid hydric sulphate, or would speak of them as the hydrogen salts of the substances in question. Thus he would name bitartrate of potash, hydro-potassic tartrate, and Rochelle salt, sodio-potassic tartrate; but from this it ought to follow that the compound analogous to Rochelle salt containing potash instead of soda (tartrate of potash), should be called di-potassic tartrate. Dr. Williamson, however, names it simply potassic tartrate, or occasionally, normal potassic tartrate. Why normal? Are the other salts *abnormal*? Other substances are treated of under names which sound strange in the ears of chemists. Who, for instance, would guess that levulose meant grape sugar? Yet that such is the case seems to be proved by a careful examination of the formula.

In remarkable contrast to Professor Williamson's book, is the small manual of "Qualitative Analysis" by Professor Gottlieb, for it does not contain a single symbol or formula from beginning to end; the cautious Professor evidently thinking it as well to be independent of ever-changing chemical theories. We think this has been carried somewhat too far, though the book is otherwise an excellent one. One feature in it calls for special remark. In speaking of the re-agents, he describes not only their actions on those substances which they ordinarily serve to detect or isolate, but also their action upon all the substances capable of being treated by Professor Gottlieb's analytical method. This is a practice which we think might be generally imitated in chemical manuals with great advantage. The chapter on the solution of bodies is also admirable.

The volume before us was left in manuscript by Charles Mansfield,[3] who was burnt to death ten years ago in the course of a splendid series of researches on the hydro-carbons. We hardly think that his friends have done him justice in publishing it in its present form. There is much that is obviously immature. Had he lived, Mansfield would not have persisted in basing a chemical classification on the results of electrolysis, for, as is pretty generally recognised, it is usually an open question whether the products observed in making an electrolysis are primary or secondary. Again, it is really hardly fair at this time of day to give all his objections to the modern chemical theories, the progress of investigation having cleared up

mental and Theoretic." Embodying Twelve Lectures delivered in the Royal College of Chemistry, London. By A. W. Hofmann, LL.D., F.R.S., &c. &c. London: Walton and Maberly. 1865.

[2] "Chemistry for Students." By Alexander W. Williamson, F.R.S, F.C.S., &c. London: Macmillan and Co. 1865.

[3] "A Theory of Salts: a Treatise on the Constitution of Bi-polar (two-membered) Chemical Compounds." By the late Charles Blackford Mansfield.

many points which ten years ago seemed to be involved in doubt. The nomenclature proposed by Mansfield is so unlike anything which is current, that few chemists will make the mental effort necessary to understand it. A few of his terms—such, for example, as base and style for the metal and acid forming part of a salt—might be adopted with advantage.

Kolbe is one of the few chemists who have succeeded in forming a chemical school. His pupils—including among others Lautermann, the discoverer of the reducing power of hydriodic acid (a discovery which has completely changed the face of organic chemistry); Griess, the author of the classical investigation of the Diazo-compounds; Guthrie, and the late Dr. Ulrich—are distinguished for a certain kind of originality, and for great practical skill in the detail of chemical research. They are, moreover, enthusiastic in their admiration of their master. The volume before us forms a kind of account of his stewardship, being issued by Kolbe on the eve of his translation from the chemical chair in the University of Marburg to that Leipsig.[4] A few pages at the beginning of the book are devoted to the history of the chemical laboratory in Marburg, then come some financial details, and then follows a short chapter on the method of chemical instruction adopted in Marburg. To this chapter we would direct the especial attention of all those engaged in teaching the science. In making a commencement with a student, avoid the use of printed tables of chemical reactions and of text-books of chemical analysis, and give minute oral instruction, making the student keep a note-book and himself construct his own tables of reactions. From the very first accustom the student to express the results of each experiment in the form of an equation. Do not confine the instruction in the laboratory to chemical analysis, but let the utmost variety of chemical preparation be made. This is Kolbe's advice, and, next to Liebig, Kolbe is the most successful chemical teacher in Germany. The remainder and by far the largest part of the book consists of an account of the researches carried out in the Marburg laboratory since the year 1859. There are no fewer than fifty-five original papers, some of them of the very highest interest. We single out the following: Two papers on the conversion of lactic acid into propionic acid, the one by Ulrich, the other by Lautermann; the transformation of tartaric and malic acids into succinic acid, by Schmitt; the direct transformation of carbonic acid into formic acid, by Kolbe and Schmitt; the secondary alcohols, by Kolbe; a paper on sarcosine, by Volhard, and two accounts of some very interesting sulphur-compounds, by Von Oefele. Certainly, the Marburg laboratory has played a very considerable part in the chemical history of the last seven years. In a preface to the "Special Researches," Kolbe remarks that these, although apparently so diverse, are for the most part a carrying out of the ideas set forth by him in 1860, in a paper entitled "On the Natural Relation subsisting between Organic and Inorganic Compounds;" and that this paper of 1860 has much in common with an earlier paper—a joint production of his own and Frankland's—which appeared in 1857 in Liebig's "Annalen," bearing the title, "On the Rational Constitution of the Fatty and Aromatic Acids, Aldehydes, Ketones, &c., and their relations to Carbonic Acid." A graceful tribute is paid to Frankland, of whom it is said that "a very great, and at all events a greater share in the origination of these ideas than seems generally to be supposed, belongs to him." Kolbe dwells on the great influence which Frankland's researches on the organo-metallic bodies have exercised in the development of the fundamental doctrine that each element has a constant capacity of saturation, and relates how Frankland and himself came to enter into a chemical partnership; and so long ago as 1856, fully recognising that carbon had a constant capacity of saturation just as much as arsenic or nitrogen, were attempting the task of building up acids, alcohols, and ketones in true inorganic substitution style. Engaged with the problem how to substitute ethyl for some of the oxygen in carbonic acid, they were startled by the announcement that Wanklyn had accidentally solved it, and that the substance produced was really propionic acid—the very thing pointed to by their theory. In reference to this discovery Kolbe says:

> "It is worthy of remark that no particular importance is attached to it by the supporters of the new theory of types, and yet it is one of the most valuable contributions to the science; and in this respect deserves a place beside the research of Liebig and Wöhler on the benzoyl-compounds, that of Bunsen on kakodyl, of Frankland on organo-metallic bodies, and of Hofmann on the direct conversion of ammonia into organic bases."

M. Figuier's Scientific Annual,[5] of which the the tenth issue is now before us, contrasts remarkably with the very poor "Year-book of Facts," which is the only corresponding publication on this side of the Channel. Mr. Timbs seems to derive his scientific facts chiefly from the newspapers, and newspaper science is not of the most reliable description; his French rival, on the contrary, goes to original sources for his information, and knows how to work it into shape when he has got it. In fact, although M. Figuier may occasionally blunder, and certainly succeeds in producing an impression that by far the greater part of the progress of science is effected by Frenchmen, his little annual volume always contains a great deal of valuable information. The present issue contains a good article on the physical constitution of the sun, an account of Helmholtz's researches on the perception of sounds, some interesting meteorological data on the summer of last year, articles on substitutes for gunpowder, an

[4] "Das Chemische Laboratorium der Universitäts Marburg." Von Hermann Kolbe. Braunsweig: Druck und Verlag von Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn. 1865.

[5] "L'Année Scientifique et Industrielle." Par Louis Figuier. Dixième Année. 12mo. Paris: Hachette. 1866.

exceedingly good abstract of the history of our knowledge of the great extinct birds of New Zealand and elsewhere, and a host of other articles of more or less interest. Journalistic science manages, however, to get a footing here and there, as, for instance, in the description of the "*Polype vinaigrier.*"

The "Causeries Scientifiques" of M. Henri de Parville,[6] are intended to fulfil nearly the same purpose as M. Figuier's Annual, but they are rather gossiping articles upon scientific subjects, than regular abstracts of contributions to the progress of science. These articles are written with more dash and spirit than M. Figuier's, but they are thoroughly French in tone, and perhaps less adapted to the wants of English readers. The subjects treated of by both are in many cases identical.

Another work of M. Figuier's, to which we called attention on its original appearance, has lately been translated into English by an anonymous author. This is his "World before the Deluge,"[7] a popular exposition of the science of Geology, giving the history of our planet from the supposed period when it floated as a nebular mass in space, to the time of the appearance of man upon its surface, and even later still, for we are treated with an account of the Asiatic or Noachian deluge, illustrated with a plate showing the destruction of a grand city of the traditional Assyrian style of architecture, with a couple of astonished mammoths in the foreground. The translation, on its appearance, was the object of a violent attack on the part of a leading daily journal; but although it undoubtedly has its defects, we do not see that these are of such magnitude as to justify its entire condemnation. The translation seems to be generally well done, and the book itself gives a tolerable sketch of geology, although fanciful in parts. It is illustrated with the beautiful woodcuts of the French edition.

An interesting sketch of a singular piece of local geology is furnished by Mr. Haswell's Memoir on the Pentland Hills,[8] which describes the curious conformation of the Silurian strata in that district, and furnishes a list of numerous fossils which have been detected in them. The Silurian beds which form the foundation of the Pentland Hills, and are capped by strata of Old Red Sandstone age, are found to be contorted in such a manner that they have become nearly or quite vertical; indeed, in some cases a backthrow may be detected. After this extreme disturbance, and before the deposition of the Old Red beds, the upper curves of the Silurians have been, as it were, planed off by denudation, and the same cause, acting subsequently, has in some places cleared away a portion of the superimposed rocks, and hollowed-out valleys in the vertical Silurian beds. It is in these valleys that the older rocks are best exposed, and to one of them especially, that bordering the North Esk, near Coalydune, Mr. Haswell's paper forms an admirable guide. The number of fossils enumerated in the author's table, and figured in the two plates with which the memoir is illustrated, is fifty-two, belonging chiefly to Upper Silurian forms. The portion of the beds best marked by its included fossils seems to approach most nearly to the Wenlock shales. We are sorry to notice a good many mistakes in the spelling of the generic names, and some little confusion as to the systematic position of some of them: thus, *Turrilepas* figures among the Pteropoda, whilst *Theca* occurs both as a Pteropod and a Crustacean.

The "Student" who has published a new "Physical History of the Earth,"[9] by no means agrees with M. Figuier in his views upon this subject. He maintains the literal truth of the account of the Creation contained in the first chapter of Genesis, and dissents, with an honesty that does him credit, from the somewhat sophistical attempts that have been made from time to time to effect a reconciliation of the conflicting statements of Science and the Bible. His mode of getting over the difficulty is rather curious. He regards the whole series of Palæozoic and Mesozoic strata as of prehistorical formation, and as being concluded by the creation of man and the existing forms of life, in the manner, and in the six days described in the Book of Genesis; the Eocene formations are treated as subsequent to this period, the Miocene as the consequences of the Deluge, and the highest tertiaries and recent deposits as Postdiluvian. But the most singular part of this author's mode of looking at geological facts is the hypothesis put forward as to the cause of the present arrangement of the materials of the earth's crust. Whilst admitting, of course, the lapse of a considerable period of time before the commencement of the Scripture history, which, indeed, is a necessary condition of the deposition of the existing strata (hard facts not to be got rid of), he maintains that there is no evidence of the numerous oscillations of level to which geologists have recourse for the explanation of these phenomena, but that the deposits have taken place continuously at the bottom of a tranquil sea, while the earth was suspended motionless, or at least *without any rotatory movement* in space, the present arrangement of the strata having been brought about by the sudden commencement of the earth's rotation at the close of the Mesozoic period! This would have the effect of producing the primitive chaos with a vengeance; but the absurdities of the hypothesis are so transparent that we suspect it will hardly find much acceptance even with the orthodox. Our student is also an opponent of the Copernican theory, and seems inclined to think that the sun really moves round the earth.

[6] "Causeries Scientifiques, Découvertes et Inventions, Progrès de la Science et de l'Industrie." Par Henri de Parville. 12mo. Paris: Lacy. 1866.

[7] "The World before the Deluge." By Louis Figuier. Translated from the Fourth French Edition. 8vo. London: Chapman and Hall. 1865.

[8] "On the Silurian Formation in the Pentland Hills." By G. C. Haswell. 8vo. Edinburgh: Nimmo. 1865.

[9] "The Physical History of the Earth." Meditations by a Student. 12mo. London: Bagster.

The Swiss seem to be coming to a determination that Alpine climbing, and the description of its delights and dangers, shall not be left entirely to English feet and hands, and accordingly we have now before us a handsomely printed volume descriptive of the charms of the Grindelwald valley and its surrounding Alps,[10] written by the pastor of the village, and a professor and mining engineer of Berne. The introductory portion is written by the pastor, and contains a description of the valley, with some account of the manners, traditions, and superstitions of its people, and a few observations on temperature and other meteorological phenomena. Professor Alby follows with a poem in blank verse on Alpine wanderings, and then with accounts of the ascent of the Wetterhorn, 8708 metres (round which the adventurers went on a subsequent day); the Schreckhorn, 4080 metres; the Eiger, 3975 metres; the Berglistock, 3274 metres; and the small Schreckhorn, 3497 metres; whilst the third author, M. E. von Fellenberg, describes the ascent of the Kleiner Viescherhorn, 3873 metres, and Pastor Gerwer that of the Mettenberg, 3169 metres. The whole of these descriptions abound in those well-known incidents of Alpine climbing which are generally read with so much interest, although the Swiss explorers do not appear to have fallen into quite so much danger as some of our more reckless English members of the Alpine Club. The account of the scenery is also very attractive, and the panoramic view of the valley, with the surrounding peaks, certainly justifies the encomiums of its pastor. The book is also illustrated with several woodcuts, and with a map of the Grindelwald district.

The series of "Treasuries" commenced by the late Mr. S. Maunder, has been continued by the publication of a "Treasury of Botany," edited by the late Dr. Lindley and Mr. Moore of Chelsea.[11] The expectation of excellence which one naturally forms from seeing such names as these on the title-page, and from the respectable list of *collaborateurs* given in the preface, is by no means disappointed by an examination of the book, which seems to us to be a most admirable and handy popular dictionary of botany. The most important plants are described under their English and Latin names, the principal terms used by botanists are well explained, the different natural orders are characterized, and even the synonyms of many groups and of important plants may be ascertained from it. One very valuable feature of the work is the careful manner in which the popular names of plants are given, and this has been done both for French and English names. These little volumes are beautifully illustrated with a great number of woodcuts from the pencil of Mr. Fitch, and with several plates of scenery showing the influence of characteristic forms of vegetation, upon the landscape.

It is unnecessary, and indeed hardly possible, for us to do much more than announce the appearance of the first volume of Professor Owen's "Comparative Anatomy and Physiology of Vertebrates,"[12] which, although a book of considerable size, includes only the Hæmatocrya, or cold-blooded Vertebrata—the reptiles and fishes of most zoologists. Professor Owen seems to regard these two groups as indivisible, and places *Lepidosiren* and its allies as a transitional order in his scheme of classification (pp. 9–18); but in the body of the work in describing the anatomical structure of the different forms of Hæmatocrya, he recognises the old-fashioned groups, and frequently refers to *Lepidosiren* under both. In treating of the modifications of structure to which he has occasion to refer, Professor Owen frequently adopts the teleological point of view; and in his exposition of the nature of the skeleton he adheres to his own previously-published opinions, both as to the relations of the limbs to the vertebral column, and as to the vertebral nature of the segments of the skull, and the homologies of its several bones. Of course the present volume does not extend far enough to come fairly upon the great brain-controversy, but this is referred to by the author in his preface, where he endeavours to reconcile the divergent statements with regard to the difference of structure in the brains of man and other animals by drawing a distinction between anatomical and zoological definitions which seems to us hardly admissible.

Dr. Häckel, a zoologist well known for his researches on the lower animals, and especially for his splendid work on the Polycystina, has commenced the publication of a series of memoirs on the Natural History of the Hydromedusæ.[13] The first part of these papers contains a monograph of the family *Geryonidæ*, a group of the naked-eyed medusæ of Forbes, of which most of the known species have been found in the Mediterranean. These animals are characterized by having a long and usually conical stalk suspended from the centre of the umbrella-like disc with which all the medusæ are provided; this stalk is called the stomachal peduncle, as it bears the small digestive cavity at its extremity. Dr. Häckel's investigations have revealed the occurrence of a very singular mode of reproduction in some of these animals, far more curious than the ordinary alternation of generations which prevails throughout the group to which they belong. The stomachal peduncle does not terminate at the point where the stomach is appended to it, but is produced into the cavity of the latter in the form of a conical tongue-like body, which in many cases may be protruded through the mouth. Now,

[10] "Das Hochgebirge von Grindelwald. Naturbilder aus der Schweizerischen Alpenwelt." Von Dr. Christoph Alby, E. von Fellenberg, und Pfarrer Gerwer. 8vo. Coblenz: Baedeker. 1865.

[11] "The Treasury of Botany: a Popular Dictionary of the Vegetable Kingdom." Edited by John Lindley and Thomas Moore. Two Parts. 12mo. London: Longmans. 1866.

[12] "On the Anatomy of Vertebrates." Vol. I. Fishes and Reptiles. By Richard Owen, F.R.S. 8vo. London: Longmans. 1866.

[13] "Beiträge zur Naturgeschichte der Hydromedusen." Von Dr. Ernst Haeckel. Erstes Heft. 8vo. Leipzig: Engelmann. 1865.

in *Carmarina hastata*, a species detected by Häckel in the Mediterranean, and probably in other species, the mature animals, already exhibiting fully-developed sexual products in the ordinary generative organs, are found to produce upon this tongue-like continuation of the peduncle a great number of buds, which are gradually developed into a totally distinct medusoid form, described under the name of *Cunina rhododactyla* as a member of a different family (the *Æginidæ*), and these creatures in their turn arrive at sexual maturity. This fact is almost as startling as the original discovery of the alternation of generations, but the observations hitherto made of the phenomena are still imperfect, especially as regards the products of sexual reproduction. Professor Allman has already endeavoured to explain the phenomena in accordance with the ordinary theory of alternations, by assuming the *Carmarina* (or Geryonid form) to be larval, and the apparent sexual organs to be "zooids" produced also by gemmation; but this view appears to be negatived by the detailed results of Dr. Häckel's investigations. Dr. Häckel gives a synopsis of the species and genera of the family, and a full description of the anatomical structure and life-history of two species—*Glossocodon eurybia* and *Carmarina hastata*. He also describes the histology of the *Geryonidæ* and the anatomy of *Cunina rhododactyla*, and discusses the relations indicated by the facts above referred to, between the two families Geryonidæ and Æginidæ. This part is illustrated with several woodcuts, and with six large and well-executed plates.

Whether the recent experiments in pisciculture and investigations into the practices of our fisheries will result in an increase of our supplies of food, remains to be seen, but there is no doubt that in the meantime they must have acted beneficially upon the commissariat of many a household. We have been almost overwhelmed of late with books and articles containing more or less of what one of the writers has denominated "fish tattle;" and the production of these must have caused a flow of a good deal of cash into the pockets of authors, publishers, and printers. The largest and most pretentious, and in some respects, perhaps, the best of these, is Mr. Bertram's "Harvest of the Sea,"[14] which contains a full discussion of the more important questions connected with our supply of sea-fish, including those raised by the reports of the Royal Herring Fishery Commissioners. Mr. Bertram comes to the unwelcome conclusion that the British sea-fisheries have been for years on the decline, owing to excessive and injudicious fishing; and in the case of the herring he shows this very clearly by means of a diagram giving the proportion of the average take of fish, and extent of net per boat, during a series of years extending from 1818 to 1863. From this it appears that during the seven years 1818—1824, the average drift of nets per boat was 4500 square yards, and the average (annual) capture of herrings 125¼ crans; whilst in the corresponding period 1857—1863, with an average of 16,800 square yards of net, each boat only obtained 82 crans of fish. The ten years 1841—1850 occupy nearly an intermediate position. With the white-fish the case seems to be much the same—the length of line, and the number of hooks employed, has been annually increasing; whilst there has been a corresponding diminution in the quantity of fish taken even by these enlarged engines of destruction. To find a remedy for this state of things is a matter of some difficulty; and this would still be the case if our knowledge of the natural history of fish were as complete as it is now confessedly imperfect. Of course the salmon, and the experiments in breeding that fish, and restoring it to rivers in which it had been nearly or quite exterminated, occupy a considerable portion of Mr. Bertram's attention, but he adds little to what has already been written on the subject. The piscicultural establishment at Huningue is described from personal inspection, and the singular fishing community of Commachio from the account given by Coste. The oyster and mussel and the edible crustacea, also come in for a share of attention, but in treating of these, as also in his opening remarks on "Fish-life and Growth," the author betrays some little deficiency of zoological knowledge. A long chapter on the "Fisher-folk" will be found interesting; it relates chiefly to those of the Scotch coasts, with whose manners the author seems to be perfectly familiar. On the whole, Mr. Bertram's book will be found exceedingly interesting and suggestive, but it seems to us that it has been unnecessarily expanded. In many parts the author is very verbose: he not unfrequently tells us the same thing, and that not particularly essential, two or three times over, sometimes even twice on the same page, and several portions, such as the entire chapter on "Angler's Fishes," including a long description of the island of Arran, might have been altogether omitted with advantage.

Mr. Hardwicke is publishing a series of popular volumes on different branches of British Natural History, the last of which is a little work on the "British Reptiles," by Mr. M. C. Cooke.[15] In this the author describes the characters and habits of the few native species of true Reptiles and Batrachia, and has certainly done his best to convince his readers that reptiles in general are undeserving of that almost universal feeling of abhorrence with which they are regarded. Mr. Cooke includes the edible frog in his list of British Batrachia, but upon evidence which does not seem to be very satisfactory even to himself; and the green lizard appears among the native reptiles upon still more doubtful grounds. The work is illustrated with tolerably executed plates of all the species, and with a good many woodcuts of details; and

[14] "The Harvest of the Sea: a Contribution to the Natural and Economic History of the British Food Fishes." By James G. Bertram. 8vo. London: Murray. 1865.

[15] "Our Reptiles: a Plain and Easy Account of the Lizards, Snakes, Newts, Toads, Frogs, and Tortoises indigenous to Great Britain." By M. C. Cooke. London: Hardwicke. 12mo. 1865.

its value is increased by a complete synonymic list, which forms an appendix.

The fossil man of the Neanderthal has probably made much more noise in the world in his present fleshless condition than he or any of his contemporaries ever did while living. The most recent publication in his honour is an excellent little pamphlet by his discoverer, Professor Fuhlrott,[16] containing two lectures on the antiquity of man. In the first of these the author discusses the general question in a popular style, and after reviewing the well-known evidence upon this subject comes to the conclusion, startling enough to many minds, that the existence of man reaches back for a period of from 200,000 to 300,000 years. The second lecture is specially devoted to the history of the Neanderthal man and his relation to the question of the antiquity of our species; and in this the author shows, in opposition to some recent statements, that from the nature of the cave in which the remains were found, it was impossible that the owner of the bones could have made his way into it since the geography of the district acquired its present condition, but that the bones must have been swept in along with the mud in which they were imbedded, and this was identical in character with the diluvial superficial beds of the district. From these circumstances, and the correspondence in the condition of the human bones with that of the bones of animals found under similar circumstances in the neighbourhood, the author maintains the diluvial age of his man, but holds, in opposition to some writers, that the peculiarities of the bones, great as they undoubtedly are, do not justify the assumption that they belonged either to a distinct species of man or to a transitional form between man and the apes.

Mr. Laing has published an account of his researches among the prehistoric remains of Caithness[17] in an octavo volume, which is enriched by a valuable memoir by Professor Huxley on the human remains discovered. These remains belong to the Stone period of the prehistoric existence of man in Britain, and most of the stone implements discovered are of the rudest type. From some indications it would appear that the primitive people whose traces are here described were cannibals. Most of Mr. Laing's researches were carried on in burial mounds near Keiss, but he has also examined some curious architectural relics, among which one shows clear indications of having been the result of the operations of three successive sets of people, the remains of each of the first two buildings having served as a foundation for their successors. The author has also found refuse heaps, or kitchen-middens, similar to those of Denmark, although presenting a difference in the species of animals of whose remains they are composed, a list of which, disfigured unfortunately by many inaccuracies of nomenclature, is given on page 50. The most interesting of the remains discovered are several bones of the Great Auk. Of the human remains, which were tolerably numerous, a full description, occupying indeed the greater part of the volume, is given by Professor Huxley; and the discussion of general anthropological questions arising from their consideration will be found of the greatest importance and interest. Professor Huxley establishes a new subgroup of Dolichocephalic skulls under the name of *subbrachycephali*, by means of which the comparison of the skulls of different races may be rendered more exact, and this is of considerable service to him in the discussion of the relationship of the primæval inhabitants of Caithness. From this it would appear that these had strong Scandinavian affinities.

The second part of Professor Karl Schmidt's "Anthropologie"[18] is devoted to the consideration especially of the intellectual life of man, which is treated in accordance with phrenological ideas. It also describes the general mechanism of life in the human body, and discusses the nature of life in general, but the whole in so transcendental a spirit, that we must in despair give up the attempt to give any notion of the general contents of the six hundred closely printed pages of which it consists.

In a work on the "Mastery of Language"[19] Mr. Prendergast advocates the adoption in the acquirement of foreign languages of the same process by which the child learns to speak its mother-tongue idiomatically, and ladies'-maids and footmen when travelling abroad attain to a familiar use of foreign idioms far more rapidly than their masters and mistresses. He maintains that the number of words necessary for speaking a language idiomatically—or rather for expressing common matters in idiomatic form—is very small; and that the idiomatic construction of sentences may be learnt from a still smaller number, upon which those expressive of new ideas may be subsequently grafted. Thus he would have the learner acquire from the mouth of a teacher a series of short sentences; these may then be varied so as to extend the vocabulary, and gradually enable the student to carry on a conversation in his new tongue. No one can doubt that this process would answer for communicating the power of speaking a language; but it must be borne in mind that for most of us the labour of learning to read would have to be superadded, and that it is not always convenient or even possible to get at an instructor of the kind recommended by Mr. Prendergast.

A complete edition of the late Sir B. Brodie's works was no doubt considered a fitting tribute to one who in his lifetime had occupied so high

[16] "Der Fossile Mensch aus dem Neanderthal, und sein Verhältniss zum Alter des Menschengeschlechts." Von C. Fuhlrott. Duisburg: Falk und Volmer. 8vo. 1865.

[17] "Prehistoric Remains of Caithness." By S. Laing, Esq., M.P., F.G.S. With Notes on the Human Remains, by Thomas H. Huxley, Esq., F.R.S. London: Williams and Norgate. 8vo. 1866.

[18] "Die Anthropologie." Von Prof. Karl Schmidt. Zweiter Theil. Dresden: Ehlemann. 8vo. 1865.

[19] "The Mastery of Languages; or, the Art of Speaking Foreign Tongues Idiomatically." By Thomas Prendergast. London: Bentley. 8vo. 1864.

a position and enjoyed so great a reputation.[20] And yet it may well be doubted whether his published works will be a lasting memorial of him. All his writings are, indeed, characterized by the exhibition of that cautious judgment and that quiet common sense, which were such marked features in his character; but in none of them is there manifest such originality as might give to them a permanent vitality, or such grasp of principle as might float them far beyond the memories of his cotemporaries. His writings and his life were the genuine expression of his character; they were both sincere and faithful performances, admirably adapted to gain the world's confidence, and to secure success and fame during life. But if Sir B. Brodie is remembered by future ages, it will without doubt chiefly be as one in the list of successful surgeons who received the well-earned honour of a baronetcy. The present edition of his works consist of three large volumes, the first of which contains, besides his autobiography, his psychological inquiries, and the addresses delivered by him on different occasions: the former simple and interesting, without being original or profound; the latter full of sound sense and ripe experience. The second volume contains his physiological papers and many of his surgical writings: the former rather representing the hopeful promise of a young man than the matured work of a scientific investigator; the latter still valuable for their sound practical observations. The third volume is filled with his pathological and surgical observations, which, though made many years ago, may still be read with profit. Perhaps the most ready way of measuring Sir B. Brodie's intellectual height, of determining what he was and what he was not, would be to peruse his estimate of John Hunter, as contained in the Hunterian oration delivered by him in 1837, and published in this edition. With admiring sympathy he catalogues Hunter's virtues, and with gentle reticence hints only at his defects; but he never penetrates the character of the man, and never once rises to an appreciation of his wonderful genius, nor seems to be at all conscious of the philosophical pregnancy of his writings. Indeed, he ventures to regret that Hunter's education had been neglected, and is hurt by the effort of attention "sometimes required to comprehend his ill arranged and involved sentences;" not seeming to suspect that new and complex thought, not appreciated by the critic, might sometimes be the cause of his difficulties. In thus giving his estimate of Hunter, he unconsciously gives the measure of himself; placing himself by the side of a man of genius, he discovers how far talent, however well cultivated, falls short of genius. In like manner the editor of the present edition discovers, by an absurdly exaggerated estimate of Sir B. Brodie in his preface, and by an almost servile prostration, how difficult it is to tell how high a mountain is when you are lying at the foot of it.

A thoroughly scientific and practical work on Urinary and Renal Diseases, by Dr. Roberts of Manchester, meets a want in medical literature, and cannot fail to be very useful.[21] It is divided into three parts, the first part treating of the physical and chemical properties of the urine, of the method of examining it, and of the various alterations which it undergoes in health and disease; the second part being devoted to diseases which, though not dependent on disease of the kidneys, manifest themselves mainly through changes in the composition of the urine; and the third part treating of the different organic diseases of the kidney. The results of the important original investigations of the author are recorded; there is evidence of a full and candid appreciation of the labours of others, both at home and abroad, in the numerous and complete references as well as in the matter of the text; and the careful description of certain rare diseases of the kidney is such as can be found in no other work in no other language. It is a well-written book, and deserves to become, what it can scarce fail to become, the text-book of students and practitioners in this country.

"The Half-Yearly Abstract of the Medical Sciences" professes to be an analytical and critical digest of the principal British and Continental medical works, but we cannot help thinking that a much more modest profession would better accord with its real character.[22] It is not so much an abstract as a compilation of long extracts from the different English weekly medical journals, made, if not at random, certainly without any recognisable principle of selection. Accordingly, it is encumbered with much trivial and worthless matter, which, but for the necessities of weekly journals, would probably never have appeared in print at all; there is no adequate, but, on the contrary, an extremely inadequate record of the progress of medical science abroad, and what contributions of value are contained in it might have been advantageously condensed into much smaller compass. By omitting, in fact, about half the matter contained in the present so-called abstract, and substituting a record of many important contributions, foreign and English, now entirely left out, and by greatly condensing the rest of the matter, a work would be produced more truly fulfilling the aim of the ambitious title. A good year-book recording the progress of medical science, which might take rank with those that are produced in Germany, has long been, and still is, very much needed in this country.

Dr. Hammond has published an interesting and instructive little volume on wakefulness,

---

[20] "The Works of Sir Benjamin Collins Brodie, Bart., D.C.L. With an Autobiography." Collected and arranged by Charles Hawkins. 3 vols. Longmans and Co. 1865.

[21] "A Practical Treatise on Urinary and Renal Diseases, including Urinary Deposits." By William Roberts, M.D. London: Walton and Maberly. 1865.

[22] "The Half-Yearly Abstract of the Medical Sciences: being an Analytical and Critical Digest of the principal British and Continental Works published in the preceding Six Months." July—December, 1865. London: Churchill and Sons.

and on the physiology of sleep.[23] He has made numerous experiments on animals with the view of determining the state of the cerebral circulation during sleep; and he entirely confirms the observations made by Mr. Durham in this country — observations which proved that there is not, as was commonly supposed, an increased, but a diminished supply of blood to the brain during sleep. Dr. Hammond discusses the causes and pathology of wakefulness, adducing examples in illustration, and gives sensible instructions as to the proper treatment of it.

The threatened advent of cholera has stimulated, not only the prayers of congregations, but all those who have peculiar theories of its nature and of the proper mode of its treatment, to impress their views earnestly on the public. Dr. Johnson has his own particular theory, and he has accordingly issued his publication as a light to lighten those now sitting in thick darkness.[24] He holds that a morbid poison in the blood is the essential cause of cholera; that this poison excites the gastro-intestinal symptoms—the vomiting and purging, by means of which the poison is eliminated; and that the correct principle of treatment is to assist the natural curative process by means of emetics and purgatives. Dr. Johnson is very contemptuous of the theories of other men, speaking of them as "speculative webs spun from the projector's brain," very dogmatic and self-confident in the enunciation of his own, very indignant at the neglect with which his discovery has been treated, and very oblivious, or very ignorant, in his own case, of the difference between hypothesis and theory, and again between theory and observation. Attacked with cholera, and threatened with his mode of treatment, a man not life-weary might devoutly exclaim, "It is better to fall into the hands of God than into the hands of men."

Dr. Chambers, having been compelled by ill health to retire for a time from practice, and to recruit his health by a holiday in Italy, has given, in a small volume, the results of his personal experience of the country, and of his investigations into its prevalent diseases.[25] He finds that there is a remarkable excess in the mortality from chronic disease in London over that of an Italian town, where the preponderance is of acute diseases, and that the excess is most striking in diseases where a tendency to degeneration of tissue is most marked. He concludes therefore that the climate of Italy is suitable to the cure of those forms of disease, and is happily able to adduce himself as a living witness of the beneficial effects of a transalpine climate. Certain diseases which he believes would be aggravated by an Italian climate are pointed out, and an earnest warning given against sending across the Alps invalids who cannot afford to spend something upon comforts and luxuries.

The amount of patient attention now given to the study of the character and properties of the tissues of the body by the most eminent scientific men must be held to be a great tribute to the wonderful genius of Bichat. By him first were the vital properties of the organism referred to the tissues, and although these were not so many as he imagined, his fundamental idea has survived and undergone great development. Two large works now before us are evidence enough of this: one of them by Claude Bernard,[26] written in his accustomed clear, interesting, and philosophical manner, and the other by Professor von Hessling, characterized by the usual patient German industry in research.[27] The former may be read with interest by those who wish to get a good general view of the present state of our knowledge of the properties of the tissues and of its historical development; the latter contains a minute and elaborate description of the elements of each tissue, and of what is known of their properties; but, being without woodcuts and without references, it is no easy matter at all times to grasp the exact character of a description, or to appreciate the weight of authority of a statement. The author feelingly expresses the difficulty he experienced in face of the "quidquid præcipies, esto brevis," and the "brevis esse laboro, obscurus fio:" he certainly has not always been brief, and we fear that he is sometimes obscure. The book contains, however, the matured results of a life spent in microscopical research, and not spent without benefit to science. It begins, in a rather startling manner, thus: "Everything in the world has a beginning. That is a well-known fact."

The title of M. Daremberg's book, now arrived at its second edition, is rather calculated to mislead.[28] It is not a history of medicine, nor an account of the doctrines of medicine, that he has written, but a number of popular essays on striking medical topics. With two exceptions, they appeared first in the *Journal des Débats*, where they were no doubt read with interest, for, without being profound either in regard of learning or thought, they contain much information that is both interesting and instructive. They treat of such subjects as the condition of medicine at Rome under the Republic, the notices of medicine by the Latin poets, Galen and his philosophical doctrines, Louis XIV. and his doctors, the history of the discovery of the circulation of the blood, the health of men of letters, and the general principles of hygiene. The information appears, however, to be chiefly derived at sec-

[23] "On Wakefulness. With an Introductory Chapter on the Physiology of Sleep." By W. A. Hammond, M.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott and Co.

[24] "Notes on Cholera: its Nature and Treatment." By George Johnson, M.D. London: Longmans and Co. 1866.

[25] "Some Effects of the Climate of Italy." By Thomas King Chambers, M.D. London: Churchill and Sons. 1865.

[26] "Leçons sur les Propriétés des Tissus Vivants." Par Claude Bernard. Paris: Baillière. 1866.

[27] "Grundzüge der Allgemeinen und Speciellen Gewebelehre des Menschen." Von Theodor von Hessling. Leipzig. 1866.

[28] "La Médecine: Histoire et Doctrines." Par Ch. Daremberg. Deuxième édition. Paris: Didier et Cie. 1865.

ond-hand from works of which the essays are reviews, and is fitted rather for those who read to be amused than for those who read with scientific aim.

M. Claude Bernard has published an admirable introduction to the study of experimental medicine.[29] Probably no one was better fitted for the task, for no one combines so well a thoroughly philosophical spirit with the experience coming from a long and successful practice in scientific experimentation. With great force and distinctness he marks out the province of observation, and shows how essential a part the well-grounded idea plays in experimental medicine; how indispensable to all good experiment is what Bacon called the *prudens quæstio*, the well-grounded anticipation, the direction of the inquiry *ad intentionem ejus quod quæritur.*

"La méthode expérimentale ne donnera donc pas des idées neuves à ceux qui n'en ont pas; elle servira seulement à diriger des idées chez eux qui en ont et à les développer afin d'en retirer les meilleurs résultats possible. L'idée, c'est la graine; la méthode, c'est le sol qui lui fournit les conditions de se développer, de prospérer, et de donner les meilleurs fruits suivant sa nature. Mais de même qu'il ne poussera jamais dans le sol que ce qu'on y sème, de même il ne se développera par la méthode expérimentale que les idées qu'on lui soumet. La méthode par elle-même n'en vaut rien, et c'est une erreur de certains philosophes d'avoir accordé trop de puissance à la méthode sous ce rapport."

M. Bernard gives us, in this philosophical introduction, the complete principles of experimental medicine, illustrating them most aptly by examples from his own experience. It is a work which should be studied by every one interested or engaged in the experimental investigation of physiological problems.

An unusually active interest on all sides in epidemic diseases is proved by the many books of late written about them; it is heartily to be hoped that the movement now manifest may issue in some definite knowledge concerning their origin and nature. Dr. Anderson has given, in a small volume, the results of his experience of yellow fever, and also of an epidemic of cholera in the island of Trinidad.[30] He affirms confidently that ammonia is a specific for cholera, as perfect and reliable in the treatment of cholera as quinine is as a febrifuge in intermittent fever. Dr. Howe[31] has endeavoured, by a study of every epidemic which has been recorded in history, to discover the laws of epidemic diseases. His first general proposition is, that epidemic visitations recur at regular intervals of time, of which eighteen and a half years may be taken as the type; and he strives to establish this proposition by a learned enumeration of epidemic visitations from the earliest times. Dr. W. F. P. Kiehl[32] has laboured to prove that epidemic diseases generally, and cholera in particular, are not produced by nature nor by climate, but by a specific human contagious virus generated by man himself, and that India was the birth-place of the poison. He gives a complete history of cholera from its origin in Bengal to its appearance in Europe, discusses at great length its etiology, treats briefly of its pathology and treatment, and concludes with an enunciation of the principles to be followed in the prophylaxis against epidemic diseases generally, and against cholera in particular.

[29] "Introduction à l'Étude de la Médecine Expérimentale. Par M. Claude Bernard. Paris: Baillière et Fils. 1865.

[30] "Handbook for Yellow Fever: describing its Pathology and Treatment. To which is adjoined a Brief History of Pestilential Cholera and a Method of Cure. By Thomas Anderson, M.D., &c. London: Churchill and Sons. 1866.

[31] "A Theoretical Inquiry into the Physical Causes of Epidemic Diseases." By Alexander H. Howe, M.D. London: Churchill and Sons. 1866.

[32] "Ueber den Ursprung und die Verhütung der Seuchen. Erläutert durch das Beispiel der ansteckenden Cholera." Von Dr. W. F. P. Kiehl. Berlin. 1865.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

To write a History of Architecture in all ages and in all countries, is an ambitious literary enterprise. Of the merits or demerits of Mr. Fergusson's history, or instalment of history, in its professional aspects, we do not constitute ourselves judges.[1] If we accept the author's estimate of his qualifications, his work, when completed, ought to possess a high value. Not only has he devoted years to the study of architecture, but he has made personal observations in almost all the countries between China and the Atlantic shore; has amassed information regarding buildings which have not previously been described, and attained an insight into the theory of the art, which is certainly even more novel! In the only volume of the work which Mr. Fergusson has yet published, the knowledge acquired from books, or gained by direct observation, is arranged in distinct divisions, treating separately of the architecture of Egypt, Assyria, Greece, Etruria, and Rome, under the general head of Ancient Architecture. Christian Architecture follows in five sections. Under this head, we have a book describing the Romanesque style, followed by one on the Architecture of France; one on that of Belgium and Holland; one on that of Germany; and one on that of Scandinavia. The volume is profusely illustrated with effective woodcuts. In the first two volumes of his projected work, Mr. Fergusson has proposed to himself to go over the same extent of ground as was comprised in the two volumes of his *Handbook*, as originally published, introducing obvious enlargements and additional chapters on Celtic, or, as they are vulgarly called, Druidical remains. The History of Modern Archi-

[1] "A History of Architecture in all Countries, from the Earliest Times to the Present Day." By James Fergusson, F.R.S., M.R.A.S., Fellow Royal Inst. Brit. Architects. In 3 vols. Vol. I. London: John Murray. 1865.

tecture will thus form the third volume of the work; a glossary will be added when a reprint is needed; and the entire work will comprise two thousand pages, in which we have an earnest that much valuable information will be found, communicated in an agreeable and often animated form. Turning from our notice of the more special divisions and general character of the book, we find Mr. Fergusson claiming a peculiar position for it as the work of a practical inquirer who has had access to sources of information of which such men as Niebuhr, Cornewall Lewis, and Grote do not suspect the existence. In short, Mr. Fergusson, with a magnificent contempt for bookworms, professes to extract history out of stone — to restore the past by the aid of archæology and ethnography. It is premature, perhaps, to judge of what Mr. Fergusson will accomplish by what he has accomplished; but on the whole we do not see that he does much more than acquiesce in the conclusions of other men (not those of Cornewall Lewis on Egypt, certainly), but those of previous explorers and historical students. Perhaps this is all he intended to do, and we may have ourselves only to thank for the disappointment we have experienced in reading the introductory portion of his work. In this portion, besides the æsthetic section, which is full of good sense, we have chapters on the races, Turanian, Semitic, Celtic, and Aryan, containing opinions or speculations which Mr. Grote or Cornewall Lewis might sometimes be inclined to disapprove; but certainly interesting, suggestive, and intelligible. Manetho for Egypt, and Berosus for Babylon, are authorities with Mr. Fergusson, who corrects or explains, with the help of his architectural organon. As regards "pre-historic man," Mr. Fergusson divides him into three groups, accepting the well-known generalization, for Europe, at any rate, of the Stone Age, the Bronze Age, and the Iron Age, corresponding with the Turanian family, the ancestors of the Celtic races, and the Aryans. In the old world, he says, the Typical Turanians were the Egyptians: from the Egyptians the Greeks borrowed, as he thinks, the Dorian style; from the Assyrians (impure Turanians or impure Aryans), they borrowed the Ionic style; and the "honeysuckle ornament, common to Greece and Assyria, is an indication of the derivative character of Greek art. Regarding the Pelasgians as a pre-Hellenic race, and getting moderately warm himself with the *bookworms who lose their tempers*, Mr. Fergusson ventures to suggest that he knows something of the Pelasgi. Here is light at last, it may be thought. Those dreadful Pelasgi are now to be brought to book, and we shall see them in their true colours, and know who they were, and where they came from, and where they went to, and all about them. Mr. Grote, believing in the *historic* Pelasgi, is convinced that the ancient Pelasgi were not knowable, but is quite willing to allow all who are so inclined to call the unknown Grecian Foretime Pelasgic, premising only that the name carried with it no assured predicates, no real extension of knowledge. Thirlwall, adopting a critical, refining process, endeavours to disengage history from fiction, and agrees pretty closely with Mr. Fergusson about his Pelasgians. As to Niebuhr, he appears to have satisfied himself that there was a time when the Pelasgians, perhaps the most extended people in all Europe, spread from the Po and the Arno to the Rhyndakus. Now what does Mr. Fergusson tell us? He takes us to the ruins at Mycenæ and Orchomenos, and infers from them that at the time of the war of Troy a people were supreme in Greece who were not Hellens, but who were closely allied to the Etruscans and other tomb-building, art-loving people, and in an Ionic-like scroll, and in the Gate of Lions at Mycenæ, he traces the Assyrian origin of this architecture. If his evidence is sound (it is not very strong), we may be justified in referring "the Cyclopean" architecture to Asia; but we do not learn who were the Pelasgi, nor have we any intimation as to what was the language they spoke. Quite conceding to Mr. Fergusson the use of the tools which he handles, we could wish often to have more result; and after his preliminary announcement, we are disappointed rather than gratified at his hitherto not very original disclosures. He quotes Mr. Layard, which is quite right; and he abridges the Rev. George Rawlinson, accepting his views of the Aryans and their religion, which these gentlemen agree was monotheistic; but we had anticipated more originality and more novel information from Mr. Fergusson. His reflections are often just; but when in his dogmatism he implies that Comte's Law of the Three Phases is disproved by ethnography, we believe him to be profoundly mistaken. Once we meet with an intimation that fairly astonishes us — that the Temple of Jerusalem was *destroyed* B.C. 972. The Exodus is dated B.C. 1312, which is a date incompatible with the statement in 1 Kings vi., which places that event 480 years before the Building of the Temple; but in this case the author seems consciously to surrender the received Bible chronology, which fixes the Egyptian deliverance in the year B.C. 1491. Mr. Fergusson's book, however, if not so original or so cogent in argument as might be expected from his own announcement, is an informing, lucid, and pleasant digest of our historical knowledge of the most useful of the fine arts— the art of building palaces, temples, churches, tombs, bridges, aqueducts.

A History of the City of Rome, forms a companion volume to that just noticed.[2] The author, Mr. Dyer, quarrels with Niebuhr and Sir George Cornewall Lewis on similar grounds to those on which Mr. Fergusson justifies his hostility. Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just; and we are bound to say that in our opinion Mr. Dyer is entitled to an occasional triumph over his opponent. But if the critic of Roman history was unduly sceptical, the

[2] "A History of the City of Rome, its Structures and Monuments. From its Foundation to the end of the Middle Ages." By Thomas H. Dyer, LL.D., author of article *Roma* in Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of Ancient Geography," "History of Modern Europe," &c. London: Longmans. 1865.

critic's critic is unduly credulous. A man who can believe in Romulus is capable of believing in a great deal. Accordingly we find that Mr. Dyer believes that there were Christian churches in St. Paul's time because he reads in 1 Cor. xi. 18, "When ye come together in the church," *ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ*. He might almost as well believe that the Apostles kept their carriages because we read, Acts xxii. 15, "After those days we took up our carriages and went up to Jerusalem." Following a sharp and sometimes successful critique on what he regards the historical heresies of the late Cornewall Lewis, Mr. Dyer gives us his version of the legendary history of Rome, not believing all the old fairy tales, but only fancying that a residuum of historic fact may be got out of Livy's recital of the primitive history of Rome. This takes us down to the burning of the city, A.C. 363. About thirteen years before this event was recorded in the public chronicle the first duly-observed eclipse of the sun, and from the beginning of the fifth century the registered numbers of the census begin to look as if they might be historical. Therefore we can go some way with Mr. Dyer in his anti-sceptical reaction, but we cannot quite see our road back to Romulus. When our author gets fairly into his subject he tells us a great deal that is worth knowing about the city and its structures, breaking up his material into separate masses, and leading from the capture of Rome by the Gauls, through the reign of Augustus Cæsar and his successors, to the death of Hadrian, and from the death of Hadrian to the death of Constantine, and onward to the extinction of the Western Empire, its restoration under Charlemagne, and the close of the Middle Ages. Research, sagacity, intelligent and recent study, all combine to make Mr. Dyer a valuable first-class cicerone. In the section on the monuments built or rebuilt by Augustus he has carefully studied the *Monumentum Ancyranum*, but not in the improved edition of Theodore Mommsen. Mr. Dyer differs from Zumpt as to the tripartite temple of Jupiter, Minerva, &c. on the Aventine; Mommsen agrees with Zumpt. Mr. Dyer considers that there was a temple to Libertas, as well as a temple to Jupiter; Mommsen thinks that the tituli Orelliani are conclusive as to the recognition of a Jupiter Libertas, and that Libertas is not here a separate divinity, and that consequently Augustus did not build two distinct temples to Jupiter and Libertas. Page 213 we find the nephews of Augustus, instead of the nephew (Perrot's reading); and in the same place we are told that Augustus presided forty-seven times at the regular games, twenty times more than the *Monumentum Ancyranum* attests. In an earlier portion of the work Mr. Dyer calls attention to the new theory of Signor Rosa, on the *Roma Quadrata*. This theory has been suggested by discoveries connected with the excavations made on the Palatine by order of the Emperor Napoleon III. who has purchased from the King of Naples that portion of it which comprises the Farnese Gardens. Signor Rosa, the superintendent of these excavations, infers, from the recently-discovered intermontium or depression traversing the hill from north to south, and dividing it, like the Capitoline, into two distinct eminences, that the city of Romulus occupied only the western portion of the hill, to which he gives the name of Germalus, one of the old names of the Palatine; while to the eastern eminence he assigns the name of Velia. Mr. Dyer is willing to accept the second part of the hypothesis, but proposes an amendment as regards the first part. He thinks that the greater portion of the western division of the hill was the original Palatium, and that the consecrated tract where the germani or twin brothers, Romulus and Remus, came ashore, was the only portion of it that bore the name of Germalus, That portion lay towards the Forum Boarium. But we must refer our readers to Mr. Dyer's attractive volume for what more he says on this subject, and the deductions which he draws from Signor Rosa's premises.

Less than two years from the present time M. Parent, travelling in the Holy Land, succeeded to his own satisfaction in identifying an isolated and rocky ascent called Djephtah, in the neighbourhood of Nazareth, with the famous Jotapata of Josephus, which the war-engines of the Romans assailed with such fatal results. The description which M. Parent gives of this spot resembles that which we find in the pages of the Jewish historian.[3] The city was built on a mountain, and accessible only on the north side. Surrounded by other mountains, it was completely hidden from the view. So Djephtah has the north side united to a mountain by a rising ground covered with ruins, and is similarly concealed from sight. Schultz and Robinson, no less than M. Parent himself, are of opinion that this is the site of the ancient Jotapata. The author of the historical *brochure* before us, after a brief introduction to his work, avails himself of the opportunity to relate the story of the first terrible episode in the work of repression which the Romans undertook to carry out. His authority is of course Josephus, in whose narrative of the patriotic defence and furious assault he sees only occasional exaggerations; the substance, and even the general circumstances of the history of the siege, as told by Josephus, being accepted as authentic. The form, however, is original, and may attract readers who, not caring to turn to the passage in the "Wars of the Jews," may yet feel pleasure in the perusal of a modern version of the siege of Jotapata in clear and vigorous French.

Gipsies and Jews have many things in common—so at least says Mr. Walter Simson,[4] in a queer sort of book, with a preface, two introductions, and a disquisition on the past, pre-

[3] "Siège de Jotapata, épisode de la Révolte des Juifs (66—70 de notre ère)." Par Auguste Parent. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 1866.

[4] "A History of the Gipsies, with specimens of the Gipsy Language." By Walter Simson. Edited, with Preface, Introduction, Notes, &c., by James Simson. London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston. Edinburgh: Menzies. 1865.

sent, and future of Gipsydom—and we shall not now dispute the truth of the assertion. In a rambling talk about gipsies, some curious information is given respecting the habits of this wandering race, which is rather a favourite with at least one of the writers, while the Jews get a regular theological wigging for their impenitent heart of unbelief. Mr. Walter Simson professes to have corresponded with Sir Walter Scott and with Mr. William Laidlaw, the manager of the Abbotsford estate, the subject of course being gipsies and their language. The "History of the Gipsies," says the editor, should have been introduced to the world long ere now; but the author, a timid and nervous man, having the fear of reviewers and gipsies before his eyes, postponed the publication. Having "descended into the tomb," he is now safe from the assaults of the critic and the Egyptian, and his more courageous representative gives us the "History" enlarged with his own rather silly disquisition. The book really does give us something like a consecutive narrative of the wandering race, from its first appearance in Europe down to the present day. As we are certainly among the outsiders whose ignorance of gipsydom excites the disdain of the editor, we shall not attempt to pass any judgment on the performance. For aught we know to the contrary, its statements may be authentic. The book contains lists of gipsy words; it partly goes with Mr. Borrow in his views, partly differs from him. The gipsy language is allowed to be Hindostani; but the gipsies are confidently pronounced not to be an expelled Indian tribe, but descendants of the mixed multitude (probably of the Shepherd Kings) that went up out of Egypt with the children of Israel, when the Jews and the gipsies, we suppose, had a great deal in common. They are, *therefore*, in some sense Egyptians, though they derive their language from their supposed place of sojourn from India. We believe that the character of their language is now a settled point. Max Müller speaks of it as belonging equally to Asia and Europe, and calls it an Aryan language. Degraded in its grammer, he observes, and with a dictionary stolen from all the countries through which the Zingari passed, this language is clearly an exile from Hindostan. The editor of the "History of the Gipsies" estimates the entire Egyptian population in the British Isles at 300,000. Mr. Walter Simson, in mentioning the gipsy sacrifice of the horse, and tracing it to the Hindoo religious sacrifice of the Aswamedha, tells us that the ancient pagan tribes of Tartary also sacrificed horses, and speculates on their possible Tartar origin. But we are getting on dangerous ground, and as we have no wish to illustrate the proverb, we break off before *catching* the gipsy's hypothetical ancestor.

Mr. Glover's Chronicle, "Le Livere de Reis de Brittanie,"[5] begins twelve hundred years before the birth of our Lord, when Brutus, the son of Silvius, with his wife Ynogen, and with his three sons, after the Trojan war was over, came to England, and ends nearly a century before Mr. Simson's descendants of the Shepherd Kings made their mysterious appearance in Europe. Mr. Glover attributes the authorship to Peter of Ickham. He does not consider that the work has any independent value; but as a careful compendium of good historians, he thinks it may be useful to students. He has endeavoured to translate the peculiar French dialect in which it is written so literally that a boy desiring to learn how to construe it, might find help in his volume. Of course the later portions of the work give pictures of life which enable us to feel our relations to the past; but in the first page we seem to be wandering out of time into fableland. When Brutus called the land Great Britain, after his own name, Eli was judge of the children of Israel. When Camber, the son of Locrius, called Wales Cambria, David reigned in Jerusalem. A few generations after an eagle used to speak, either at Canterbury, Winchester, or Shaftesbury, or at all three places. After that, again Blaudud built Bath. He also made the Hot Baths. Afterwards he made himself wings and flew as far as London, then called Trinovant, and there he fell and broke his neck—the best thing that could happen to so flighty a personage. We do not see the great use of this publication, but we think Mr. Glover's patience in working his way through the chaos of early French truly admirable.

This chronicle brings us down to the fourteenth century. Mr. T. A. Trollope resumes his "History of Florence" with the fifteenth.[6] This history of four hundred years is characterized by the action of the democratic faith that freedom is the one great need, without which all else availed not to save the city. Unfortunately, this love of liberty degenerated into an egotistical individuality; and the real love of freedom, the love which values the liberty of others as fully as our own, was not the animating motives of Florentine politics. Mr. Trollope explains that with the extension of the old city frontiers, and the acquisition of peasant-peopled strips of surrounding territory, the townsman and countryman alike of the new domain became simply subjects of the sovereign commonwealth, and not fellow-sharers in its sovereignty. Thus the arrangement of the relation subsisting between the conquering and the conquered constituents was, in point of fact, "the old Roman municipal theory of social constitution, so wonderfully indestructible in the minds and instincts of the Italian people —the *civis Romanus* idea." Mr. Trollope, accordingly, while acknowledging the claims of Florence to the kindly sympathies and admira-

[5] "Le Livere de Reis de Brittanie et le Livere de Reis d' Angleterre." Edited by John Glover, M.A., Vicar of Brading, Isle of Wight. Published by the authority of the Lords Commissioners, &c. London: Longmans. 1865.

[6] "A History of the Commonwealth of Florence from the Earliest Independence of the Commune to the Fall of the Republic in 1531." By T. Adolphus Trollope, author of "The Girlhood of Catherine de' Medici," &c. &c. In four vols. Vol. III. London: Chapman and Hall. 1865.

tion of the world, still contends that in the annals of her stormy but prolific life, she has left mankind a larger legacy of warning than of example. The Medicean period is of course that specially treated of in these concluding volumes of Mr. Trollope's valuable and attractive history. Mr. Trollope has written somewhat diffusely, but with excellent purpose and effect, on the character of that brilliant despotism. The Medicean absolutism was the natural antecedent of Florentine subjugation. Florence became more exclusive, more egotistical, more demoralized, as the system of personal domination developed itself, as the people were better fed and better amused, as the artisan was more profitably employed, and the professor of literature, of art, and every liberal pursuit, was more honourably entertained. The anti-absolutist reflections of Mr. Trollope, sound as they are, would gain in force if they were expressed in fewer words; and as no human arrangement is so good but what it carries with it some defects or inconveniences, so, perhaps none is so bad but what it offers some advantages which go to make the sum total of evil less. It may be doubted whether Mr. Trollope has done complete justice to the good in the Medicean tyranny; while he has done his utmost to bring out its evil. On the varied contents of his work we have too little space to expatiate. His third volume opens with the death of Giovanni de Medici, the author of the popular taxation reform, the wealthy banker and founder of the family greatness. The government of Cosmo, his son, the builder of sumptuous structures and the encourager of philosophy and art, is described in this book. The seventh book ends with the conspiracy of the Pazzi, and the eighth with the flight of Pietro de' Medici. This book records the death of Lorenzo the Magnificent, the merciless captor of Volterra, the appropriator of the funds destined for the marriage-portion of the citizens' daughters, and the destroyer of so many innocent victims after the conspiracy of the Pazzi. "The death-bed confession," in which Savonarola stands by the side of the penitent, is an impressive narrative. The story of the remarkable man, thus introduced, is told partly in the eighth and partly in the ninth book, which contains the history of the Medicean interregnum. This is, perhaps, the most interesting portion of the whole work. The figure of the prophet moves through it, persuading, influencing, ruling the people. Much of what Mr. Trollope says of the failure and incoherence of this earnest whole-hearted priest, a man eager to fight against evil, yet, if our historian be right, frustrating his own objects by the use of the political power that the times had placed in his hands, is well worth consideration. Yet are not some of his objections equally applicable to the mystic and prophet, in all times and in all places? The profession of prophet is a precarious one, jeopardizing the sincerity of the man; and possibly, though no charlatan, the Italian seer may have had his hours of professional insincerity. Following the martyrdom of Savonarola, we have an account of the struggle before Pisa, the progress of Cesare Borgia, and the war policy of the soldier-pope, Julius II., who drove out the French, the very people whose arrival was so desired by Savonarola. The tenth and last book depicts the events in the history of Florence from the return of the Medici to the fall of the republic, A.D. 1530. Mr. Trollope is so good an historian that we only regret that he is not a better one. His industry is great, his research praiseworthy, his knowledge comprehensive, his style fluent, animated, and manly, his reflective faculty sufficiently vigorous. His remarks on the influence of Platonism, on monetary affairs, on absolute government, on fantastic superstition in an age of perishing faith, all show that Mr. Trollope thinks as he writes. But his possession of partial power serves to make us discontented. He gives us so much that we want more. His narrative is spirited, but the actors hardly seem alive. He does not make us see the scene which he tries to paint. He wants concentration and graphic force, a realizing imagination—in short, his style, though pleasant, is often diffuse, and occasionally recals the sensational paragraph writer. His colloquialisms are detestable. It is bad enough "to come to grief" in his pages, or "do things in a genteel style," but when he talks of Volterra "kicking up its heels for the fourth time," we kick up our own and trot off.

Far inferior to Mr. Trollope in the mental qualities necessary for historical composition, Mr. Yonge has written his volumes on the Bourbon rule in France, in language free from vulgarisms, and an enthusiasm cooled down to freezing-point.[1] His well-behaved and extremely respectable Muse begins her tale with a review of the events that preceded the accession of Henry IV., and proposes to continue it to the deposition of Charles X. His estimate of Henry, in the fourth chapter of the work, is thoughtful and impartial. In an earlier chapter he contrasts the condition of France, when the assassin's knife terminated his reign, with its condition twelve years before, when his predecessor, Henry III., was murdered. It was estimated that during the entire period of the civil war a million of people had been killed, and 128,000 houses destroyed. Barefaced dishonesty was the rule and not the exception. The most upright of the nobles helped themselves from the national purse, or made free with the royal revenue; the most corrupt of their order, the men who had directed the finances of the kingdom, to facilitate and conceal their delinquencies, complicated and perplexed the public accounts, so that it was almost impossible to ascertain the amount of revenue or expenditure, and therefore almost impossible to suggest a remedy. In short, commerce and trade were annihilated, and the manufacturing and agricultural arts were nearly forgotten. On the death of Henry IV. "order and tranquillity had taken the place of outrage and faction; economy and purity had superseded waste and corruption; the treasury

[1] "The History of France under the Bourbons, A.D. 1589—1830." By Charles Duke Yonge. Author of "The History of the British Navy," &c., &c. Vols. I., II. London: Tinsley Brothers. 1866.

was relieved of debt; the revenue was augmented, yet no class was oppressed by undue or excessive exactions." The merit of Mr. Yonge's book is its compactness. He gives you a correct summary of events; but he seldom or never throws life or colour into his narrative. In his portraits of the principal actors in the Bourbon drama, so far as it has been played in these volumes, he endeavours to present you with a faithful, not a faithfully-striking likeness. Generally impartial, his prepossessions we suspect are Conservative. Perhaps his bias in favour of royalty inclines him to put in a plea for Catherine, and his love of established order to describe Cromwell as "the murderer." Though deficient in picturesque detail, the narrative sometimes records an interesting or illustrative fact. Thus Mr. Yonge identifies the Man in the Iron Mask with Matthioli, the minister of the Duke of Savoy, who for an alleged betrayal of confidence incurred the displeasure of Louis XIV., who kidnapped and threw him into a prison, and to keep his seizure secret compelled him to wear a mask of black velvet which he was never allowed to remove. So the statement that, in ten years' duelling, two thousand gentlemen of France had perished, exemplifies the manners of the times. The Pope's eulogy on the fanatic Clement, and his comparison of the benefits which his crime secured for the human race, to those consequent on the incarnation and resurrection of Christ, shows us the true nature of that zeal which is not according to knowledge. In p. 53 of vol. ii. we find a double account of the origin of the name of La Fronde, a word adopted as a party badge. The explanation given by De Retz is, that one of the deputies, a M. Bachaumont, deriding the pusillanimity of his colleagues who were very bold in the absence of the Duke of Orleans, but abated their pretension when he was present, compared them to the school-boys *slinging* under the city walls, who, when they saw the police coming to interrupt their sport, ran away, but resumed it as soon as the officer had turned his back. The explanation given by Mademoiselle de Montpensier is somewhat different. Bachaumont said of his party, she observes, "je la fronderai bien"—*fronder* having a metaphorical meaning, like a rather unclassical expression of our own, "to have a shy at." The word was caught up, repeated, sung in a jingling rhyme by Barillon, and finally when the parliament and its supporters broke out into open insurrection, appropriated by the party called collectively *La fronde*, each individual member being termed *un frondeur*. But we must leave the reader to trace in Mr. Yonge's own pages the history of a war which Michelet calls the most ridiculous of wars—a revolt of the lawyers. With the dissolution of the Fronde terminated ninety years of civil commotion. It began in the minority of Louis XIV., in the year of the treaty of Westphalia. Mr. Yonge closes his second volume with the death of this king, whose reign was the longest that has ever been granted to any monarch, and who, if not a great king, was the official representative of a great age in France. How many more volumes will be required to complete this somewhat dry but not uninstructive history, we cannot say.

In 1662 the Grand Monarque purchased Dunkirk of Charles II.[8] About five years after a Dutch fleet anchored up the Thames, a detachment of it forced the chain at Chatham, burned several of the finest ships, and carried off the *Royal Charles*, the largest of all, to be sent as a trophy to Holland. In the panic created by the tidings, the unprotected state of the ships and forts was the subject of indignant discussion, and the generality of the people not only grieved, but "suggested their discontent" against those who counselled the king to sell Dunkirk, caused the strength of Upnor Castle to be taken away, and in short, were answerable for the mismanagement of the naval affairs of the country. The proceedings of the Dutch fleet, the action of the citizens of London, the conclusion of peace, and the meeting of parliament, are some of the topics illustrated in the Calendar of 1667, edited by Mrs. M. A. Everett Green, who has introduced the volume with a preface, and facilitated its examination by a general index.

About a hundred years after the Revolution which finally disposed of the Stuart family in England, occurred the terrible catastrophe which in a neighbouring country prepared the way for the final overthrow of the ill-fated and, generally speaking, ill-conditioned Bourbons.[9] Detesting the crimes of the French Revolution, though still believing it to have been a beneficent event, we welcome any exposure of the errors into which the advocates of that revolution have fallen. Among the critics of the historians who have regarded it with favour, is M. Mortimer-Ternaux. Since the first volume of this gentleman's history of "La Terreur" was published, four others have appeared, of which we have seen only the last. This fifth instalment commences with the recital of events following the triumph of Dumouriez, and ends with the trial and execution of Louis XVI. The author's judgment of the king's character is in unison with the estimate which is universally accepted. Louis was a good, amiable man, but an incapable king. Constitutionally inviolable, M. Mortimer-Ternaux thinks that, on that ground, if on no other, Louis ought to have escaped his miserable fate; but he adduces evidence in proof of his position, that the votes of some of the members of the Convention were in direct contradiction to their real convictions, and were extorted not by their reason but by their fears. We are sorry to find the name of the great Carnot in the list of those who would have given a different ver-

[8] "Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of Charles II., 1665, preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office." Edited by Mary Ann Everett Green, author of "The Lives of the Princesses of England." Under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, &c. London: Longmans. 1866.

[9] "Histoire de la Terreur, 1792—1794, d'après les documents authentiques et des pièces inédites." Par M. Mortimer-Ternaux, de l'Institut. Tome Cinquième. Paris. 1866.

dict had they dared. We should have more confidence in our author if we did not find him mistaking Thomas Paine for an American; at least he describes him as a *publiciste Américain*, and he calls the United States his country, though in reality only his adopted country. What excuse, in any case, is there for an author who undertakes to correct his predecessors spelling the "rebellious needleman's" name with a Y? In the sixty pages of elucidatory notes at the end of the volume is an inquiry into the truth of the story of the alleged poisoning of Gamain, the locksmith, reported by "le bibliophile Jacob," and erroneously alleged by the historian to have been adopted by M. Louis Blanc. M. Mortimer-Ternaux does not believe a word of it. His refutation of the calumny should be read attentively by those who do, of whom Louis Blanc is not one.

The "History of the British Empire in India from 1844 to 1862," is a record of the leading events in war and government, written in a fluent and readable style by Mr. Lionel James Trotter.[10] It is intended to form a sequel to Thornton's "History of India." Far from considering it as exhaustive or finally authoritative, Mr. Trotter declares that the period of which he writes has yet to be worthily handled by "some future Milman, gifted with all the special knowledge of the late Mr. James Mill." The work is designed to be completed in two volumes. The first only is published. It brings the history down from the appointment of Lord Hardinge to the retirement of the Marquis of Dalhousie. Mr. Trotter is fortunate in his subject, the period he has chosen being, as he well describes it, remarkable in itself for great events, sweeping changes, splendid conquests, and "for one tremendous uprising of Eastern pride, ignorance, ambition, fanaticism against Western zeal, learning, haughtiness, strength of will, and readiness to trample on all opposing claims of feeling or tradition." His narrative is a lucid, well-written chronicle of the great battles and political changes, the most remote of which have occurred during the lifetime of men who are still young. Many who have followed the progress of Indian events, who perhaps were personally interested in the great campaigns of the Punjab, or in the military incidents of the Burmese war, many to whom the names of Moodkee, Ferozshubur, Aliwal, and Sobraon, suggest an almost classical renown, may trace their history in the quiet and flowing narrative of Mr. Trotter. What brilliant reputations were acquired in this period of 1842—1862 may be seen almost at a glance from the volume before us. Pottinger, Napier, Edwards, Gough, Campbell, Dalhousie are among the many distinguished men whose abilities in battle or in council were employed to uphold or extend our British Empire in India. In the concluding volume we shall find others, of equal note, whose heroic and sagacious acts fill the interval between the vice-regency of Lord Canning and the final enthronement of the parliamentary council which has superseded the great Company in whose name and under whose authority that empire had attained so rapid and so magnificent an extension.

In Mr. R. G. Watson's "History of Persia" during the present century, we have a work which, in its general character, resembles that which we have just noticed.[11] It is intended, in some sort, as a continuation of Sir J. Malcolm's work, but goes back a little way to give a summary of the leading events which prepared for the establishment of the Kafar dynasty towards the end of the last century. The introductory chapter describes the country and the people, their manners, education, religion, and prospects. The manners consist in the practice of general immorality, including dishonesty, mendacity, and intolerance. The education consists chiefly in reading, writing, and arithmetic. The religion is a sectarian Mahommedanism, and the prospects are semi-stagnation and British rule. On the other hand, every village in Persia has its bath and its ice-house; and though domestic slavery exists there, all field-labour is free. Two hundred and fifty-three monarchs have mounted the Persian throne in succession, and the constitutional theory of Persia is, that the king is the State, and that all men live for the king. The authority of the king, or shah, is checked by the precepts of the Koran. The military force of Persia is supposed to consist of a hundred thousand men. The soldiers are hardy, patient, enduring; but all their good qualities are neutralized by the vicious regulations of the country. Till the Earl of Mornington selected Captain Malcolm as our representative at the Court of Tehran, in or about 1800, no English diplomatist had been employed in Persia since the reign of Charles II. The object of this mission was twofold—to counteract the possible designs of the French nation with regard to Persia, and to relieve India from the annual alarm of the threatened invasion of Zemar Shah. A commercial treaty and a political treaty were concluded between the envoy from India and the prime minister of Persia. The Russian war ending in the peace of Gulistan, and the cession of eight or more provinces to the invading power, the renewal of war, the seizure and capture of Erivan, and the treaty of Turkomanchai, the accession of Mahommed Shah, and the siege of Herat, the suspension of diplomatic relations between England and Persia, the declaration and conduct of the war between these two countries, and the defeat of the Persians and restoration of peace in 1857, with the treaty signed by Lord Cowley at Paris, are among the salient topics of Mr. Watson's narrative. Some indications of advancing civilization in Persia are given in this history. But the ill success and premature fate of the Meerza Teki Khan, the commander-in-chief of the Persian

[10] "The History of the British Empire in India, from the appointment of Lord Hardinge to the Political Extinction of the East India Company, 1844 to 1862," &c. By Lionel James Trotter, late of the 2nd Bengal Fusiliers. In 2 vols. Vol. I. London: Allen and Co. 1866.

[11] "A History of Persia, from the beginning of the Nineteenth Century to the year 1858, &c." By Robert Grant Wilson, formerly attached to Her Majesty's Legation at the Court of Persia. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1866.

army, and the possible regenerator of his country, shows the true condition of Persia, and seems to point the moral that "no Government can force progress if the people be unsound." The story of this ill-starred minister's career may be contrasted with the popular (not the official) triumph of the fanatic Bab. Bab declared the mission of Mahommed at an end, announced himself as the inaugurator of a new era, asserted that he was God, or an incarnation of God, and contended that heaven was his true home. The temporary disappearance of Bab, just before he was shot to death, had led his followers to infer for a moment that he had actually ascended into heaven. The inference was destroyed before it hardened into faith. In endeavouring to escape, Bab missed his way, was recaptured and shot; but Zinjah, which his adherents had seized, was still defended by courageous men and devoted maidens. "In vain were the conspirators shot, sabered, or burnt to death. They met their fate with the utmost firmness, and none of them cared to accept the life which was offered to them on the simple condition of reciting the Moslem creed. Bab was shot in the month of May, 1850.

The political attitude of Napoleon I. after his matrimonial alliance with Austria, the menacing prospect of a Russian war, and the consequent danger to Prussia, caused all the friends of Frederick William to rally round their king. Among them was Gneisenau, who, in conjunction with Hardenberg, Scharnhorst, Boyen, and Blücher, projected different political and military plans, strengthened the fortresses, and promoted the efficiency of the army. Gneisenau's career is described in the circumstantial life, of which G. H. Pertz has published his second instalment.[12] His activity appears to have been incessant. In Austria, Russia, Sweden, and England, he endeavoured to carry out the project he had at heart—the overthrow of Napoleon. The Prince Regent, the Duke of York, and the Duke of Cambridge were favourable to his views. His decided military talent, his indefatigable zeal, his conduct in battle, his general career in fact, till his appointment as Governor-General of Silesia, are the subjects of discussion or narration in the second volume of Pertz's life of the distinguished field-marshal. A third volume is promised, bringing the biography down to the second peace of Paris.

Numerous biographical works await our notice—a notice which, in some instances, must be very cursory.

Captain (?) Henderson, "The Soldier of Three Queens,"[13] served in Portugal, when the object of the Brazilian expedition which he had joined was to establish Donna Maria on the throne of that country: in Spain, where he acted as Captain in the British Auxiliary Brigade, and fought in the cause of Queen Isabella till the termination of the War of Succession. After this he joined the 12th Lancers as first-assistant in the riding department—"marched with that corps by the Overland Route from India to the Crimea—was present at the siege and capture of Sebastopol, and the subsequent operations between Eupatoria and Simpheropol—and returned with the regiment to England at the Peace," when, being in extremely bad health, he quitted the service of the third Queen whom he had had the honour of serving. An orphan, whose father died in debt, a soldier of fortune, a driver of a coach, and a gentleman jockey, *Captain* Henderson has had various adventures and experiences, which he has told, perhaps with some allowable embellishments, in his own lively, "rough-and-tumble" fashion. He gives his own view, less from personal observation than on evidence, of the battle of Balaclava, Nolan's famous order, Lord Cardigan's noble and gallant bearing, the perfect acumen and judgment of Sir Colin Campbell, and the military incapacity of civilians for the appreciation of military movements, and even military language.

A popular "Life of Richard Cobden,"[14] offers a sufficiently full and a really interesting account of the great free-trade statesman, who even in his life-time became an historical character. We wish that Mr. McGilchrist, his admiring biographer, had not called Cobden an apostle, nor made occasional use of other tall words; but in such a case a little sign-painting may be easily tolerated. Mr. Cobden was born at Dunford, near Midhurst, in Sussex, on the 3rd of June, 1804. Before Cobden was born, Charles Fox sat for the borough, and in its grammar-school Sir C. Lyell, like Cobden himself, received the rudiments of education. Other local associations might be particularized which make this part of Sussex classical. For the life of the "Apostle" himself we send our readers to Mr. McGilchrist's pleasing volume.

Captain Gronow's final reminiscences[15] are recorded in the fourth volume of the entertaining series which he has given to the world. The concluding instalment contains some amusing anecdotes and some tolerable *mots*. A few weeks before his death Captain Gronow wrote, "I have lived long enough to have lost all my dearest and best friends." An Eton boy, an officer in the Guards, serving in the Peninsula and present at Waterloo, a member of Parliament, and a man of fashion, Captain Gronow led a life full of incident, and his gossiping narratives sometimes indicate that he had been a part of all that he had seen. Descended from an ancient Welsh family in Glamorganshire, he entered the army at the age of eighteen, and

[12] "Das Leben des Feldmarschalls Grafen Reithardt von Gneisenau." Von G. H. Pertz. Zweiter Band. 1810 bis 1813. Mit einem Steindruck. London: Williams and Norgate. 1865.

[13] "The Soldier of Three Queens: a Narrative of Personal Adventure." By R. Henderson, late of the 12th Royal Lancers, and formerly Captain in the British Auxiliary Brigade in the Service of H.M.C. Majesty the Queen of Spain. In 2 vols. London: Saunders, Otley, and Co. 1866.

[14] "Richard Cobden, the Apostle of Free Trade," &c. By John McGilchrist, author of "The Life of Lord Dundonald," &c. London: Lockwood and Co. 1865.

[15] "Captain Gronow's Last Recollections: being the Fourth and Final Series of his Reminiscences and Anecdotes. With a Portrait." London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1866.

died in Paris on the 20th of November, 1865, in his seventy-second year. We gather these facts from a short and sensible advertisement prefixed to "Captain Gronow's Last Recollections."

The memoir of a merchant prince and public benefactor of Glasgow,[16] who represented his native city in the Reform Parliament, travelled in Italy, and wrote long, informing letters containing his impressions of the scenery, art, and inhabitants of that beautiful peninsula, will interest friends and local patriots; but it is too long, in our opinion, and the style is heavy and laborious. Mr. James Ewing of Strathleven was distinguished as much for the universality as the magnificence of his benefactions. A schedule of bequests, in Dr. Mackay's "Memoir," indicates that he gave away upwards of 70,000*l.* to asylums, institutions, societies, churches, &c. Mr. Ewing, a scholar and antiquarian, was a member of the Maitland Club, and practically supported its literary character by the publication, in two quarto volumes, of "The Cartulary of the See of Glasgow." Born the 7th of December, 1775, he died on the 29th of November, 1853.

After the letters of this charitable archæologist, we will glance at the "Letters of Mozart,"[17] translated by Lady Wallace, from the collection of Ludwig Nohl. As the original work has already been noticed in a previous number of this *Review*, we shall only express our pleasure at seeing Mozart's simple, affectionate, graceful, and sportive correspondence presented in an intelligible form to an English public, by a lady whose long and patient discharge of the duty of interpreter gives us a general confidence in her rendering, and entitles her to our grateful recognition.

A somewhat similar case calls for similar treatment. 'Franz Schubert, a Musical Biography,"[18] is less a translation than a condensation from the German of Dr. Heinrich Kreissle von Helborn, by Mr. Edward Wilberforce, who has obtained the author's permission to select what he thought would be new and valuable to the English reader. In making this selection Mr. Wilberforce has not adhered to the words, nor followed the arrangements of the original. Sometimes, too, he has inserted opinions of his own. In particular, he has added an essay on Musical Biography, in which some of his remarks on the superfluous matter found in kindred works are correct enough, but perhaps hardly worth the trouble of recording.

The life of another great artist, of Raphael Santi, the Sophocles of the glorious art of Form and Colour,[19] would be worth telling, if there were anything to tell. Unfortunately, there is nothing to tell, and Alfred Baron von Wolzogen has told it. Of course, what we say must not be taken too literally. Raphael was born, for instance—place, Urbino; time, 28th of March, 1483. His father was Giovanni del Santi, a painter of merit in the city where his son first saw the light. Raphael lost both father and mother before he was twelve, became the pupil of Perugino, the friend of Fra Bartolomeo and Ridolfo Ghirlandaio, and the protégé of the patriotic Pope Julius II. In the time of Leo X. the papal court occupied the apartment decorated by his pencil. Raphael was once engaged; the name of the lady was Maria di Bibbiena, the niece of the Cardinal Santa Maria in Portico. He was never married. Soon after his arrival in Rome, his biographer tells us, "he appears to have formed an affection which only terminated with his life;" adding, in an unconscious epigram, "though it cannot be considered quite certain whether it was always one and the same maiden whom he loved during this period." In this case, Raphael must have resembled Byron's coquette, who, when she vows eternal attachment, simply specifies three weeks. "According to the records of the Abbate Melchior Missirini, *which are, however, not very credible*, his beloved was the daughter of a turf-burner, living near Santa Sicilia, on the other side of the Tiber." From an annotated copy of Vasari's "Biographies," it *appears* that the girl was called Margarita; "she is now generally called the Fornarina, without any decided testimony whence the name arose. She *may have been* the same maiden who, according to Vasari, was in Raphael's house at the time of his death;" all of which potential-mood information is extremely satisfactory. As Raphael was born, so also he died on Good-Friday, which our author calls the anniversary of the day of his birth; but which, being April 6th, was assuredly not his birth-day. His death, at thirty-seven years of age is attributed by some of fever, or feverish cold; by others to sensual excesses and over-bleeding. As usual, little is really known of the cause of his death; but, says our author, "that he loved women is an established fact;" so that we get at last a glimpse of one glorious certainty. Such is the life of Raphael, who "believed in the mother of God and all his saints," and who, with his "Greek eye and Christian feeling" created beauty, which, in his biographer's judgment, makes him to the modern world what Pheidias was to the ancient. Baron von Wolzogen's criticism is often interesting, and his ample account of the artistic career and the works of Raphael will be valued by those who are adequate judges of those deathless productions. The biography has been translated by Miss

[16] "Memoirs of James Ewing, Esq. of Strathleven, formerly Lord-Provost of Glasgow and M. P. for that City, LL.D. of the Province of Glasgow. With a Series of Letters written while on a Tour in Italy, Switzerland," &c. By the Rev. Macintosh Mackay, LL.D. Glasgow: James Maclehose. 1866.

[17] "The Letters of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1769—1791), translated from the Collection of Ludwig Nohl by Lady Wallace. With a Portrait and Facsimile." In 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1866.

[18] "Franz Schubert: a Musical Biography. From the German of Dr. Heinrich Kreissle von Hellborn." By Edward Wilberforce, Author of "Social Life in Munich," "One with Another." London: William H. Allen and Co. 1866.

[19] "Raphael Santi: his Life and his Works." By Alfred Baron von Wolzogen. Translated by F. E. Bunnett, translator of "Grimm's Life of Michael Angelo," and "Gervinus's Shakspeare Commentaries." London: Smith and Elder. 1866.

Bunnett, who has long been regarded as a competent interpreter.

The next work that comes to hand is a biographical farrago by Mr. Cyrus Redding.[20] The past scelebrities of whom he offers us his random records, amount to twenty. Among them are Canning, Hazlitt, Schlegel, Talma, O'Connell, Cuvier, Belzoni, and Czartoryski. The papers which we like best are those on Horace Smith, Haydon, Turner, Wolcott, Parr, Colton, and Beckford. Mr. Redding assures us that Turner was born at Barnstaple, in North Devon. Mr. Thornbury, we believe, states that he was born in Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, we presume erroneously, as Turner was himself Redding's informant. Colton, the author of "Lacon," must have been a curiosity; he was a clergyman and an unbeliever. To escape a painful operation he committed suicide. In the notice on Parr, we find a story similar to that told of a late admirable preacher: "Do you know what end Don't-care came to, Mr. Robertson?" "Yes, madam; he was crucified on Calvary." When Gerald was tried in a Scotch Court for sedition, in defending himself he justified Reform, and said that Christ was a Reformer. "*Yes,*" *said one of the judges,* "*he was a Reformer, and mickle did he get by it!*" It is impossible to deny that Mr. Redding has produced some amusing pages; but he is by no means an able writer or a vigorous thinker. His style is often singularly clumsy: his trite reflections degenerate into twaddle; and he has not the ready or accurate information which a literary man of his pretensions might reasonably be expected to possess. Why shouldn't he know, or, having known and forgotten, why couldn't he find out the name of the real or supposed compiler of that church creed which a patriarch of Constantinople thought might have been written by a drunken man? Probably Mr. Redding meant Vigilius of Thapsus, or Hilary of Poictiers. If Parr, however, affirmed that either of these persons was the author, he affirmed more than he could prove; for the author of the creed with the *damnable* clauses, as by a happy solecism Mr. Redding once called the Athanasian symbol, is still unknown. Again, Mr. Redding might have been better informed about Pitt's last dying speech, since we have the authority of Mr. James Stanhope, who was present at his death, for attenuating the grandiloquent apostrophe—"Save my country, Heaven!" into the rather prosaic exclamation—"Oh, my country! how I leave my country!" and that not in the agonies of death, but about two hours before his death. What will the admirer of Goethe say to the critical judgment of the appreciator of "Past Celebrities," when he reads in the notice on Madame de Staël, that the first of modern poets was one who did more harm than good in the world? that the mind which worked out the half-human devil, was not a mind to be envied? that his creations are all artificial, and that he never felt what he affected to feel? Or, "noting the scepticism of Germans as general," what shall we say of such a silly sentence as that in which we are told Madame de Staël was of course a stranger to the notions of Strauss, Hegel, and others of the present day? Hegel died in 1831, Madame de Staël in 1817; but as Hegel had already written his "Phänomenologie des Geistes," we see no reason why such an intellectual heroine should not have known something of Hegel's "notions"—though he was certainly not of the *present* day. On the other hand, Strauss and others, who *are* of the present day, could not very well have flourished in a past day. At any rate, they did not flourish till after 1817. Of course, therefore, the lady *was* a stranger to their notions; but need Mr. Redding have told us this?

A work of a similar description, but with more fun and less reflection in it, has been recently given to the world by Lord Willian Lennox, who has seen life in most of its phases, and has enjoyed peculiar facilities of approach to various inner circles, which he has described with a high-bred, good-fellow sort of cleverness that invites a lazy intermittent perusal.[21] His portrait gallery does not show the hand of an artist, and some of his portraits might perhaps be dispensed with. Still, in a superficial way he paints the manners of the times, gossips about illustrious personages and brilliant reputations, and tells anecdotes, many of them quite new, about men and woman in cottage and palace; about duellists, actors, actresses, bishops, poets, prize-fighters, naval and military officers, kings and queens, emperors and statesmen. A quotable story of a true reformer, who was not a first-rate shot, may serve as a specimen of this Ana. "One day, when enjoying a day's sport with a friend in the country, and when pheasants and hares were numerous, the noble lord made no addition to the bag. On taking leave, and seeing the gamekeeper, he remarked, 'I suppose I am about the worst shot you ever saw.' 'Not at all, my lord,' responded the man; 'I've seen many a worse; you misses them all so cleanly, my lord.'" Among the men whom Lord William Lennox saw, and some of whose features he still remembers, are Wellington, Byron, Kemble, Brummell, Theodore Hook, Sir Robert Peel, Count d'Orsay, Sydney Smith, Talleyrand, Haynes Bayley, Gully the pugilistic M.P., and Fauntleroy the banker-convict. "George IV., too, as Prince Regent, and King William IV., the Dukes of York, Beaufort, Richmond, and St. Albans, the Prince Louis Napoleon, and the Emperor Napoleon III., are among the inmates of 'his' noble and royal gallery, which is closed by the bust of the late Prince Consort."

"Shadows of the Old Booksellers"[22] is also a collection of portraits, but, unlike the preceding work, it has a genuine purpose, a unity of subject, and a real literary character. Mr. Knight has called up some of the people of the

[20] "Past Celebrities whom I have Known." By Cyrus Redding, author of "Fifty Years' Recollections," &c. In 2 vols. London: C. J. Skeet. 1866.

[21] "Drafts on my Memory: being Men I have Known, Things I have Seen, Places I have Visited." By Lord William Pitt Lennox. In 2 vols. London: Chapman and Hall. 1866.

[22] "Shadows of the Old Booksellers." By Charles Knight. London: Bell and Daldy. 1865.

past, who, not always remarkable in themselves, yet have a decided if secondary interest for us —first, because they are the representatives of what may be called pre-eminently the Trade of Intellect (some would suggest *in* Intellect, like Campbell, who toasted Napoleon for shooting a bookseller); and secondly, because they are "accompanied with shadows of many of the immortals of literature." Of these intellectual middlemen, some, as Mr. Knight himself acknowledges, are obscure and ill-defined, nor are their annals particularly attractive. The first of the shadows that we care for is Jacob Tonson, son of the barber-surgeon of the particoloured pole which advertised the shop in Holborn, who published for Otway and Dryden, and first made "Paradise Lost" popular. Tonson and Lintott were Pope's booksellers. Samuel Richardson is reviewed both as critic and bookseller, and Mr. Knight's portrait of him is one of the best in the book. John Bell, of the Strand, deserves special notice. He introduced the pocket volume, nicely printed and appropriately embellished. For one daring reform he is entitled to the special gratitude of all little and some big boys; he discarded the *long s*, and thus contributed to the diffusion of reading made easy. Hutton, Cave, Longman, Rivington, Murray, Curll, Dunton, and many others will be found in the shadowy procession led by Thomas Guy and closed by James Lackington, at the summons of one who is happily not *yet* qualified to take a distinguished place as author-bookseller in the illustrious but unsubstantial brotherhood.

"A Picture History of England"[23] contains eighty-five large engravings and three hundred odd pages of letter-press. Mr. Dulcken, the narrator, has brought together the salient facts of English history in a readable form, and told them with a liberal emphasis. We are surprised, however, to find the story of the "Massacre of the Welsh Bards" recorded by a writer who has *endeavoured* to keep out of his volume "anything the reader would afterwards have to unlearn."

The second volume of a reprint of the "History of New France,"[24] by Marc Lescarbot, will interest the antiquarian geographer. "New France" was the name given to that part of North America now called Canada, by Giovanni Verrazani, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, when he took possession of it in the name of Francis I., in whose service he was then retained. The history is the production of an eye-witness, and was first published, we believe, before the middle of the seventeenth century.

"The Superstitions of Witchcraft,"[25] by Mr. Howard Williams, "is designed to exhibit a consecutive review of the characteristic forms and facts of a creed which, in the seventeenth century, was a living and lively faith." We recommend it as a popular digest of witch-knowledge, as well as for the moral which it suggests; we mean that there are cases in which it is duty to reject human testimony, whatever be the number and whatever be the character of the witnesses. The orthodox witch-believer could refer the sceptic to the highest theoretic authority, the Bible, for evidence of the existence of witches, to the statute-book of all civilized countries, to the experience and practice of centuries, to the evidence of thousands of accusers, and perhaps of hundreds of thousands of the accused themselves. The great doctors of the church, the decision of learned lawyers, the unanimity of jurors, the procedure of parliament, the opinion of kings, nobles, churchmen, could all be cited in vindication of the diabolic reality of the alleged crime. Catholic and Protestant, the Eastern and Western, the Old and New World, alike believed in witchcraft. Luther and Innocent VIII., Charlemagne and James I., Erasmus, Francis Bacon, Judge Hale, Jewell, and Hooker, all believed in dæmoniacal agency, nearly all in the common form of the popular superstition. Yet, in spite of this accumulated weight of authority and testimony, we refuse to believe in the principles and practices of witchcraft. In England, as a consequence of the disgraceful credulity of the undisciplined human mind, seventy thousand persons were executed during the period 1603—1680; while in fifteen centuries of Christianity, nine millions of men, women, and children have been burned or hanged as a sacrifice to superstitious ignorance. Such at least are the estimated numbers; and in the second instance the computation has been made or approved by Dr. Sprenger, who considers it by no means an immoderate one.

BELLES LETTRES.

His severest critics, we suppose, will not deny Mr. Dickens genius, not of the highest indeed, but still of a very rare order. When we look back at his long gallery of portraits, Sam Weller, Chadband, Pecksniff, Pickwick, and Mrs. Gamp; when we consider how much we should lose if deprived of all these, and all their whims and fancies, we must confess that their creator does not belong to the common roll of authors. But on the other hand, when we compare Mr. Dickens to the world's great humorists, Aristophanes, Molière, Swift, Cervantes, and Shakespeare, then we see how far short he comes of the highest rank of genius. Pecksniff weighs as chaff in the balance against

[23] "A Picture History of England. From the Invasion of Julius Cæsar to the Present Time." By H. W. Dulcken, Ph. D. Illustrated with Eighty Engravings by the Brothers Dalziel, from Designs by A. W. Bryce. London: George Routledge and Sons. 1866.

[24] "Histoire de la Nouvelle France, contenant les navigations, découvertes," &c. Par Marc Lescarbot. Enrichie de cartes. Nouvelle édition, publiée par M. Edwin Tross. Vol. II. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 1866.

[25] "The Superstitions of Witchcraft." By Howard Williams, M.A., St. John's College, Cambridge. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1866.

Tartuffe, and Pickwick is a mere monster beside the Don of Spain. The more we study Falstaff, Gulliver, and Sancho Panza, the more we perceive the art of the artist and thinker, but the closer we look at Mr. Dickens's characters, the more we detect the trickery of an artificer. The more we analyse Mr. Dickens, the more we perceive that his humour runs into riotous extravagance, whilst his pathos degenerates into sentimentality. His characters, in fact, are a bundle of deformities. And he appears, too, to value them because they are deformed, as some minds value a crooked sixpence more than a sound coin. He has made the fatal mistake against which Goethe warned the artist. Everything with him is not *supra naturam*, but *extra naturam*. His whole art, as we shall presently show, is founded upon false principles. When we put down a work of his, we are tempted to ask, *Quid hinc abest nisi res et veritas?* And if this criticism may be pronounced upon his master-pieces, what can be said of his later works? Our answer must be found in our remarks upon "Our Mutual Friend."[1] As it is impossible for us here to analyse the whole work, we must content ourselves with a chapter. To do this in most cases would be as absurd as to exhibit a man's tooth as a specimen of his eloquence. But Mr. Dickens does not suffer by the process. He is seen to the best advantage in detached pieces. And we shall take the chapter on Podsnappery, both because it has been so much praised by Mr. Dickens's admirers, and because, too, we think it is most characteristic of his mind. A more suitable character than Podsnap could not have fallen into Mr. Dickens's hands. We fully sympathize with him in his hatred of Podsnappery. For Podsnap, be it known, is the incarnation of Grocerdom, that stolid British Grocerdom, which deems that only coronets and titles make heroes, only silks and jewels heroines, that the feast of reason comes only with venison, and the flow of wit only with Sneyd's claret—that Grocerdom where riches instead of elevating only enervate their possessors, instead of refining only brutalize each passion, and instead of broadening only swathe the mind in intolerance. In a crusade against this Mr. Dickens has our warmest wishes. And Podsnap, if well conceived and well carried out, might have been the pendant of Pecksniff. But when we open the chapter, we find it an explosion of dulness. A number of automatons are moving about, who are all, so to speak, tattooed with various characteristics. There is the great automaton Podsnap, who is tattooed with a flourish of the right arm and a flush of the face, and the minor automaton Mr. Lammle, who is tattooed with ginger eyebrows. Dancers are called "bathers," and one of them is distinguished by his ambling. In fact Mr. Dickens here seems to regard his characters as Du Fresne says the English did their dogs, *quanto deformiores eo meliores æstimant.* The conversation is still more wonderful. Mr. Dickens here alternates between melodrama and burlesque. If he is not upon stilts he goes upon crutches. For instance, take the following—

> "Said Mr. Podsnap to Mrs. Podsnap, 'Georgiana is almost eighteen.'"
>
> "Said Mrs. Podsnap to Mr. Podsnap, assenting, 'Almost eighteen.'"
>
> "Said Mr. Podsnap then to Mrs. Podsnap, 'Really I think we should have some people on Georgiana's birthday.'"
>
> "Said Mrs. Podsnap then to Mr. Podsnap, 'which will enable us to clear off all those people who are due.'" (Vol. i., p. 98.)

The only thing we can compare with this wonderful passage is "Peter Piper picking pepper." Let us now turn to the satire. Here are Mr. Podsnap's views upon art—

> "Literature; large print, respectfully descriptive of getting up at eight; shaving close at a quarter past, breakfasting at nine, going to the City at ten, coming home at half-past five, and dining at seven." (p. 97.)

Now as these exact words are repeated under Painting and Music and again under Dancing (p. 104), we must conclude that Mr. Dickens thinks he has written something very effective. Our comment is that sham wit like a sham diamond, can cut nothing. But then whilst some jokes are dull, others are old. Thus we read of an epergne "blotched all over as if it had broken out in an eruption" (p. 99.) This poor old joke has broken out year after year amongst Mr. Dickens's followers ever since Leech's woodcut of the page "who had broken out into buttons and stripes." The chapter also contains a specimen of Mr. Dickens's bad grammar. We are told that a certain meek young man "eliminated Mr. Podsnap's flush and flourish" (p. 106), whereas the context shows that he produced them. Such a blunder implies that Mr. Dickens knows neither the meaning of the French *éliminer* nor the Latin *elimino*. He appears to confuse "eliminate" with "elicit." The chapter, however, may be taken as a very fair specimen of the whole work. *Tota Natura in minimis.* Much of the caricature in the second volume is simply like trying to frighten a man by making faces at him; whilst in the chapter on "The Voice of Society," Mr. Dickens becomes as angry as a woman, and as inconsistent as the *Times*. But more extraordinary than any chapter is the preface, or postscript, or apology, for we don't know what to call it, which closes the work. It is divided into five sections, and each section contains a separate fallacy, except one, which contains two. In the first, Mr. Dickens lays down the proposition "that an artist (of whatever denomination) may, perhaps, be trusted to know what he is about in his vocation." Mr. Dickens's later works are the best refutation of his own words. He attempts to be a satirist when he is only a caricaturist, and a philosopher when he is only a humorist. That a man who, as far as can be gathered from his works, has never read a word

[1] "Our Mutual Friend." By Charles Dickens. With Illustrations by Marcus Stone. London: Chapman and Hall. 1866.

of Aristotle, should hold such a doctrine, is natural enough. The second contains the old rock on which Mr. Dickens has so often been shipwrecked. His object in "The Mutual Friend," he says, is to "turn a leading incident to a pleasant and useful account," that is to say, if we rightly understand him, to set forth the wrongs of Betty Higden and the Poor Law. Now, true art has nothing to do with such ephemeral and local affairs as Poor Laws and Poor Law Boards; and whenever art tries to serve such a double purpose, it is like an egg with two yolks, neither is ever hatched. This clause also contains the further fallacy that a work of art is best produced in a serial form. As Mr. Dickens gives no reasons whatever for this opinion, we cannot possibly examine them. In the third clause Mr. Dickens defends the plot of his story by the fact that it is founded on reality. But how does that affect the matter? Truth is not always probable. And it is probability which is required in a novel. When honest Wilars de Honecort, in the thirteenth century, wrote under his carved animals, "et saciez bien quil fu contrefais al vif," he only showed how far he still was from a true conception of art. Further, Mr. Dickens's conduct of the plot makes the story still less probable. In Greene's play of "Tu Quoque" occur the following stage directions: "Here they two talke and rayle what they list," "Here they all talk." This may be taken as a short summary of the conduct of the personages in "The Mutual Friend." In the fourth section Mr. Dickens explains his views about Betty Higden and the Poor Law. Our reply is that a novel is not the place for discussions on the Poor Law. If Mr. Dickens has anything to say about the Poor Law, let him say it in a pamphlet, or go into Parliament. Who is to separate in a novel fiction from fact, romance from reality? If Mr. Dickens knows anything of human nature, he must know that the practical English mind is, as a rule, repelled by an advocacy in the shape of fiction. And to attempt to alter the Poor Law by a novel is about as absurd as it would be to call out the militia to stop the cattle disease. The fifth and last section is entirely personal. We believe that all England would have been deeply shocked had Mr. Dickens been killed in the Staplehurst accident. But many minds will be equally shocked by the melodramatic way in which he speaks of his escape. Those who are curious to understand the tricks of his style should analyse the last section. He first endeavors to raise a joke about Mr. and Mrs. Lammle, "in their manuscript dress," and his other fictitious characters being rescued from the railway carriage, and then turns off to moralize and improve upon his own escape, concluding the whole with a theatrical tag about "The End," which refers both to the conclusion of his book and his life. We write this in no carping spirit, but because it so fully explains to us the cause of Mr. Dickens's failures, a want of sincerity, and a determination to raise either a laugh or a tear at the expense of the most sacred of things. After all that can be said, Art is still the flowering of man's moral nature.

In novels as in ladies' dresses, fashions have their day. A few years ago the Jane Eyre pattern prevailed, then Sensationalism, and now Bohemianism. Some half-dozen Bohemian novels and tales lie before us. Thus, to take them alphabetically, Mr. Austin gives us a new story.[2] He is best known as a satirist, and has not forgotten his power. Terrible things are said against publishers and critics. The critics will probably believe what is said against the publishers, and the publishers against the critics. As we are not afraid of hard blows, we will quote a passage against the critics. "Marston Light was one of the most cynical, selfish, ill-tongued, cruel-penned littérateurs of the town. Somebody said of him that he had read the Sacred Scriptures as hastily as the books which he reviewed, and that he had in consequence totally misunderstood the divine admonition, and invariably did to his neighbours what he took precious good care they should never do to him" (vol. i. p. 11.). This is not bad as jokes go now-o'-days. We would, however, advise Mr. Austin to draw his illustrations from less sacred sources. As it is, he lays himself open to the charge that he is seldom witty without being profane, and often profane without being witty. He has, however, great powers of description, to which, in the present work, he has scarcely done justice. Though the offices of critic and prophet should be kept distinct, still we are inclined to predict that Mr. Austin may really distinguish himself as an essayist or satirist.

Passing by some minor names we come to Mr. Winwood Reade's "See-Saw."[3] It is evidently founded upon a careful study of "scrofulous French novels." As it is French in style, so is it French in its moral—

> "Le scandale du monde est ce qui fait l'offense,
> Et ce n'est pas pécher, que pécher en silence."

We regret to speak so severely, for there is much that is clever and epigrammatic. The account of the "Craven" and its members is, to say the least, vigorous. In detached passages Mr. Reade excels. Looked at as a whole, the art is coarse and clumsy. He is constantly shirking his work. And there are in a novel two ways of escaping the difficulty, either to say that a thing surpasses description, or that it is too well known to need description. Mr. Reade has recourse to both. Further, in proportion as he endeavours to interest us with his principal characters the more he fails. True love, true art, are to him either unknown worlds, or else he cannot describe them. With his minor personages he succeeds better. Darlington, like Rosie Raffles in Mr. Austin's story, appears to be drawn from life. Like Mr. Austin, too,

[2] "Won by a Head. A Novel." In Three Volumes. By Alfred Austin. London: Chapman and Hall. 1866.

[3] "See-Saw. A Novel." By Francesco Abati. Edited by W. Winwood Reade. London: Edward Moxon and Co. 1866.

we should imagine that Mr. Reade would distinguish himself more in some other field of literature than in that of novel writing.

Lastly, by the necessity of our alphabetical arrangement, comes Miss Thomas.[4] She has long since established a reputation as an authority on gloves, horses, and oaths. Versatile and clever, she contrives to do herself as much injustice as her worst enemies could possibly wish. Take for instance such a passage as this—"When one feels the setting sun at all, it is always in 'the small of the back,' and forthwith a helpless feeling of vulgarity, and a wild desire to sneeze sets in. His brazen rays, in fact, make one feel wicked, or weak and dusty." (Vol. iii., p. 64.) Now if Miss Thomas has really discovered any such physiological fact, by all means let her put it forward in a scientific treatise. Her evidence, however, is valuable, for we can now explain various passages in her work, by supposing that she wrote them with her back to the setting sun. Her hero, we may remark, falls in love with three women, two of whom are married. In short, her ethics in the present tale seem somewhat like those of the Bosjeman's—"it is right to steal another man's wife, but it is wicked when one's own is stolen." Some portions, as in all Miss Thomas's works, are cleverly done; the scene between Daisy and her lover in the beginning of the third volume is excellent, whilst the "Menagerie" may fairly be set against Mr. Winwood Reade's "Craven." But the fault of the story, and there cannot be a worse fault, is its moral tone.

And now turning from stories with more or less of a Bohemian bias, we will select some with a different tendency. First comes Mr. Alexander Smith's attempt.[5] In our last number we called attention to his unjustifiable attack on Leigh Hunt. We regret to say that there is the same disposition to sneer at other Liberals in the present work. Now novels are not the place for political vituperation. Mr. Smith, however, reaches his climax of bad taste in vol. ii. ch. viii. A gentleman, who thinks it decent to call the majority of his countrymen "donkeys," should at least be able to point to some higher qualities than we can discover in the present work. Some of the early chapters are prettily done, and Mr. Smith can always describe scenery. But the power of moralizing vaguely upon all things, and letting loose a description here and there, hardly constitutes a novelist.

We should be sorry to say one word that might seem flippant upon "Hidden Depths."[6] It treats of a subject which no one can approach without much sadness,—a subject, however, which we do not think suitable, in the way in which it is here handled, for a novel. The author, we should suppose, is either a young curate or a woman. No other beings could possibly have imagined such scenes. *Fingunt creduntque.* The book is put forward as being substantially true, whereas it is substantially false. General accusations are valueless. We can, however, point to a particular passage—vol. ii. p. 20—which shows how little reliance can be placed upon the author. The passage cannot well be quoted. And we should advise none but those who may consider it a duty, to test our words to refer to it. The value of the evidence is thus set at rest, and the value of the morality may be gauged by the following sentiment—"True virtue can have no existence except on a foundation of dogmatic truth." (Vol. ii. p. 157.)

"The Grahames"[7] would certainly seem to be a first attempt. The author's strong point is description. It is however, sadly overdone, as in the account of a certain sunset (vol. i. p. 40). The sketches of characters are coarse, whilst the author's habit of punning renders some of the personages doubly offensive.

"The Man of his Day,"[8] is also apparently a first production. Fine writing is also its great blemish. Thus the lightning leads one person "like a pillar of fire," whilst a bay is so bright that it makes another person "dizzy," which we should imagine is just what the lightning should have done. Such phenomena, however, lend an unusual interest to an intrigue or a love scene.

To atone for all these failures, we have, however, "Wives and Daughters."[9] It is decidedly the greatest novel since "Romola." Whether we look at the art of its construction, the natural development of situation after situation, the ease of the dialogue, the subtle humour and happiness of description, it is in each admirable. Many passages rival the best scenes in Miss Austen. The minor characters are as carefully executed as the more important. A sense of reality—and this should be the aim of the novelist—pervades every scene. To justify our remarks is here impossible. We must be content to wear "the foolish face of praise." Let us, however, call attention to such delicate touches as little Molly's "Please, papa—I wish to go—but I don't care about it;" to poor Mrs. Hamley, asking if a son "who wrote such poetry, could do anything wrong?" and to the old butler "who thinks that anger is a good thing for Thomas." "Dear Clare," and Cynthia and Mr. Gibson are, in their different ways, sure to be admired, but the minor strokes of humour of a great artist are often missed. And Mrs. Gaskell's humour is free, on the one hand, from any vulgarity, and on the other hand from any exaggeration—tender and true. And the perfection of the work adds poignancy to our

---

[4] "Walter Goring. A Story." By Annie Thomas. In Three Volumes. London: Chapman and Hall. 1866.

[5] "Alfred Hagart's Household." By Alexander Smith. London and New-York: Alexander Strahan. 1866.

[6] "Hidden Depths." Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglass. 1866.

[7] "The Grahames of Bassbridge House, Dydborough." By Mrs. Trafford Whitehead. London: Chapman and Hall. 1866.

[8] "The Man of his Day. A Novel." London: Chapman and Hall. 1865.

[9] "Wives and Daughters. An Everyday Story." By Mrs. Gaskell. In two volumes. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1866.

grief. When lately a great satirist and novelist was taken away, most of us felt our sorrow lightened by the thought that he had accomplished his work, but now when her fame was at its highest, and her powers at their greatest, has the authoress of "Mary Barton" been snatched away, and there is nothing left for us but to pay a mournful tribute of praise.

Excellent, too, in their way are the Essays of O'Dowd,[10] rattling and racy. The author's assumption of a disguise, however, is something like the Queen travelling under the title of the Duchess of Lancaster. No one can mistake him. Everywhere is be at home, and on everything has something to say. It has been remarked that the present generation cannot pay a compliment or play a hand at whist like their fathers. If anyone will turn to the dedication he will see that the first assertion is wrong, whilst another passage will give him a reason for doubting the last. But this rattling style has its drawbacks. Accuracy is not amongst its merits. Thus we read that "life is carried on, like the American war, by substitutes." (p. 5.) This assertion has certainly been disproved over and over again. At the beginning of the war it may have been true, but not during the real struggle. So, too, the joke about the "new terror of death" (p. 287) belongs not to Lord Lyndhurst, but Arbuthnot, and was first used in reference to Curl. Again, the story of the port-wine (p. 101) is originally told not of a City man, but of a celebrated nobleman long dead.

Volumes of poetry are nearly as numerous as novels. Those who can't write the latter, appear to write the former. This is the only way we can explain the average dulness that pervades such works. Hesiod speaks of poetry as

"*Αησμοσύνη τε κακῶν ἄμπαυμά τε μερμηράων,*"

but these books are each quarter the renewal of cares and the beginning of difficulties. To praise such poetry is to do infinite harm. Happy indeed is that reviewer who can say, "Thank God, I have never praised a minor poet." On the other hand, to condemn them mercilessly is to be most unjust. With all the vanity, affectation, and weakness that is in them, much that is amiable and at least inoffensive is to be found. The chief fault is, that the writers have neither imagination nor ear. Good feelings, unfortunately, will not supply thought, nor amiable intentions rhythm. Here, for example, is Mr. Washington Moon[11] with a sacred poem. We remember him not long ago in prose. He waged war with Dean Alford. The combatants fought. We know not who won, but each has now sung a hymn. The Churchman put forward a volume of mixed poetry; the layman, however, gives us nothing but what is scriptural. The value of the Dean's book we have already shown; and the utmost praise that we can give "Elijah" is that it is something like an Oxford prize poem put into the Spenserian stanza, with "Salem" at the beginning, middle, and end.

Mr. Fulford's beautifully bound volume[12] simply illustrates the truth of Goethe's saying —there are many echoes, but few voices. Like Mrs. Prideaux, whom we noticed a short time ago, he has caught the mannerism of Tennyson's style and the ring of some of his thoughts. Mr. Leighton[13] is far more original. A man who can strike out such happy phrases as "honey-scented meadows," and "brooks silver-slippered," has certainly a true eye for nature; whilst one who can write such lines as

"The form of thought
Goes with the age—the thought is for all time—"

shows that he, too, can really think. His great fault lies in extreme redundancy. We wish poets would not so often remind us of Hesiod:

"*Νήπιοι, οὐδὲ ἴσασιν, ὅσῳ πλέον ἥμισυ παντός.*
Οὐδ' ὅσον ἐν μαλάχῃ τε καὶ ἀσφοδέλῳ μέγ' ὄνειαρ."

If they practised the first line, they would be better able to describe the pleasure in the last.

Mr. Bradbury[14] prefaces his poems with the following extraordinary introduction—"At the end of this volume will be found extracts from notices of the press of my works published in 1859. To insert notices of such a kind may be objected to by some persons; but it is thought they may serve to guide the judgment of those critics into whose hands my previous volume did not fall." As we are not in the habit of taking our opinions from the *Times*, from which nearly half a page of eulogy is given, Mr. Bradbury must not be surprised at our declining under these circumstances to notice his work.

If Mr. Chorley[15] does not fall into platitudes, he certainly never rises into the region of thought. If there is nothing to censure, there is certainly nothing to praise. If there is *nulla mica salis*, there is, on the other hand, *nulla gutta fellis*. The volume may very fairly be said to represent the average poetry which any man of an amiable disposition might with moderate cultivation produce.

Dr. M. J. Chapman gives us two series of "Idylls,"[16] one sacred, the other secular. We must say that we infinitely prefer the latter.

[10] "Cornelius O'Dowd upon Men and Women, and other Things in General." Third Series. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons. 1865.

[11] "Elijah the Prophet. An Epic Poem." By G. Washington Moon. London: Hatchard and Co. 1866.

[12] "Launcelot. With Sonnets and other Poems." By William Fulford, M.A. London: Edward Moxon and Co. 1866.

[13] "Poems." By Robert Leighton. Liverpool: Edward Howell. 1866.

[14] "Lyrical Fancies." By S. H. Bradbury. London: Edward Moxon and Co. 1866.

[15] "The Wife's Litany. Ballads, and other Pieces in Verse." By John Rutter Chorley. London: Chapman and Hall. 1865.

[16] (1) "Hebrew Idylls and Dramas." By M. J. Chapman, M.A. London: Saunders, Otley, and Co. 1866. (2) "The Greek Pastoral Poets. Theocritus, Bion, Moschus." Done into English. By M. J. Chapman, M.D. Third edition. London: Saunders, Otley, and Co. 1866.

Regular feet and accurate rhymes will certainly not, by themselves, add beauty to the noble English version of the Old Testament. Theocritus suits the translator's powers better. But even here we should prefer an average prose translation to Dr. M. J. Chapman's rhymes. His rendering of the famous xv. Idyll (the Adoniazusæ) reads tamely beside Mr. Matthew Arnold's prose version. To English readers, however, the translation will be of much interest, whilst the notes furnish all requisite information.

Mr. Gibbs' poems[17] in some degree resemble those of Mr. Leighton. Like him, he takes a high view of life and its duties, and has a real regard for Nature. But both he and Mr. Leighton must remember that no high place can possibly be attained in poetry without much labour and severe training. The Muses are hard taskmistresses; they accept no half-and-half homage. You must serve them entirely or not at all. "The Story of a Life," which is the longest, is also the best in the book. As also in Mr. Leighton's case, the comic pieces are failures.

In "Lost and Found,"[18] Mr. Wilson not only shows fluency but power. He does himself, however, great injustice in jumbling metaphors together thus—

> "Time sows no seeds which bear so rich a yield
> As shattered hopes—they multiply themselves!
> Let one be jarred, the others tremble too;
> E'en as a single ripple on the lake,
> Caused by a pebble cast."

And so on through two more lines. Simplicity, as it is the most difficult, is the last thing attained in art.

"Lays of Italy,"[19] and "The Idylls of the Hearth,"[20] both deserve a word of praise, not so much for the poetry as for the tendency of thought and feeling. The former is full of admiration for liberty and Garibaldi, whilst the other deals with homelier subjects. In both cases the authors must find their reward in their work.

Last of all come Sir Bulwer Lytton's "Lost Tales of Miletus."[21] They stand to his other poems much as the "Caxtoniana" stands to the rest of his prose. We find less of the old smartness; the tinsel is not so tawdry; the commonplaces are less numerous; or perhaps we had better say that the story and the setting prevent them from being very conspicuous; still they are here. Thus such expressions as "teaching thewing souls" (p. 11), and "breath balming the morn" (pp. 17, 20), are in the old "Pelham" vein. The literary tinsel crops out in such lines as—

> "War is the child of cloud,
> Often stillest just before the thunder,"—p. 22.

Where the first sentence is evidently the child of the second. The old commonplaces bud and blossom again in—

> "Life hurries on to meet the point it sprung from,
> Youth starts from infancy and age returns,"—p. 148.

Which is only the old Bulwerian way of saying that "age is second childhood." Still these faults do not violently obtrude themselves. And we may fairly pronounce the stories as graceful, picturesque, and superficial.

If, however, we can find no original poet this quarter, we have, at least, two excellent collections of poetry. The charming edition of Mrs. Browning[22] will, we trust, extend her fame. The selection is well and carefully made. The two greatest achievements of women certainly in our day are "Romola," and the poems of Mrs. Browning. No woman has, on the whole, done for women more than she has. The other is a selection of religious poetry, chiefly from modern authors.[23] The selector has not only exercised wise judgment, but shown an unusual catholicity of taste. He gives us not only English but American poets—not only Protestants but Roman Catholics. He is not afraid to quote either from Sir Aubrey De Vere or Emerson. Arthur Clough will be found side by side with John Henry Newman, and Miss Rosetti opposite to Miss Procter. We much wish, however, that he had gone further afield. He scarcely quotes at all from the Elizabethan poets. And after what Lamb has done, there can be no excuse for being ignorant of their beauties.

If, too, we have no original poetry, we have at least what is the next best thing, an excellent translation of the "Iliad."[24] We have so recently given our opinion as to the superiority of blank verse over the so-called English hexameter, that we shall not here enter into the question further than to observe that Mr. Wright quotes from Longfellow—its acknowledged master—the admission that "the motions of the English muse in that measure are not unlike those of a prisoner dancing to the music of his chains." We have, indeed, been accused of favouring blank verse, because, forsooth, Lord Derby used that metre. It is certainly a novelty for this Review to be accused of an aristocratic bias. We trust the reproach will be removed when we say that Mr. Wright's version is, in most respects, equal to Lord Derby's. They stand on equal pedestals. Neither

[17] "The Story of a Life, and other Works." By William Alfred Gibbs. London: A. W. Bennett. 1866.

[18] "Lost and Found. A Pastoral." By J. Crawford Wilson. London: William Freeman. 1865.

[19] "Ruggiero Vivaldi, and other Lays of Italy." By Eleanor Darby. London: Trübner and Co. 1866.

[20] "Idylls of the Hearth." By Joseph Verey. London: Aylott and Son. 1865.

[21] "The Lost Tales of Miletus." By the Right Hon. Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, Bart., M.P. London: John Murray. 1866.

[22] "A Selection from the Poetry of Elizabeth Barrett Browning." London: Chapman and Hall. 1866.

[23] "Poems of the Inner Life." Selected chiefly from Modern Authors. London: Sampson Low, Son, and Marston. 1886.

[24] "The Iliad of Homer." Translated into Blank Verse. By Ichabod Charles Wright. London: Longmans, Green, Reader, and Dyer. 1865.

of them, however, has approached to the delicacy, music, and colouring which Tennyson has thrown into a famous passage. Whether Tennyson could sustain this high standard is another question. And here let us call attention to a new edition of the "Odyssey."[25] Scholars may differ as to the value of the readings adopted in the text, but no one can doubt the value of the marginal references, and the scholarship of the notes. This is not the place to enter into discussions as to the authorship and date of the "Odyssey." It is sufficient to say that these questions are dealt with by Mr. Hayman in the trenchant style which Professors Connington and Goldwin Smith first introduced. His book must certainly become the text-book of the "Odyssey."

"The poet," *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, in England, means not Homer but Shakspeare. And we are glad to see so many new editions of him. First and foremost, both in size and popularity, stands Cassell's Illustrated Edition.[26] One of the editors is well-known by her Concordance, and the other by his "Shakspeare-Characters." It is meant for the people, and is both cheap and useful. The notes are to the point. The editors show good taste, though, perhaps, their feelings here and there override their judgment, as in their comments upon "peonied and lilied brims ("The Tempest," act iv. sc. 1). Here and there, too, little absurdities peep out, as in the remarks upon "the man, the dog, and the bush in the moon" ("The Tempest," act ii. sc. 2), that "an Italian once pointed out to the editors the figure of a dog in the full moon." After so much has been written upon the subject, the mention of the Italian is a little superfluous. For Mr. Selous' illustrations we can say but little. He shines most amongst the lower characters, and is more at home with Quince, Snug, and Bottom, than with Titania and her elves.

Mr. Dyce's edition[27] is in many respects just the opposite to Mr. and Mrs. Clarke's. He writes for the scholar and not for the multitude. His notes recal both the criticism and the satire of the days of Porson and Herman. He is unsparing to his opponents, especially Mr. Collier. The following note upon "Go, get thee to Yaughan" ("Hamlet," act v. sc. 1), is a fair sample of his style:

> "Mr. Collier, in the second edition of his Shakspeare, adopts his Corrector's 'yon,' and certainly the Corrector is fortunate in such an expositor as Mr. Collier, without whom we never should have guessed that 'yon' is equivalent to 'yon alehouse.'"

The method in which Mr. Collier illustrates his Corrector is, to say the least, remarkable. For some time past we have been waiting to see his refutation of the very serious charge brought against him in Mr. Grant White's recent "Life of Shakspeare" (p. 151, footnote.)

Mr. Dyce, too, in other respects presents a contrast to Mr. and Mrs. Clarke. He is never led away by poetical feeling, or a mere love of beauty. Thus "in Macbeth" (Act v. sc. 3) he prefers, and probably rightly, the plain "way of life" to the more poetical "May of life." Again, too, in the same play (Act iv. sc. 3), he reads "summer-seeming lust," in preference to Blackstone's poetical "summer-seeding lust."

The game of emendations is very popular. Not long ago a certain critic nearly re-wrote all the chorusses in Æschylus. The emendations were undoubtedly ingenious. There was, however, one slight fault—the emendator wrote such ungrammatical Greek. Something of this sort is the fault we have to find with Mr. Bailey's clever book.[28] He is so dreadfully ingenious. Thus, on a well-known passage in the "Midsummer Night's Dream," he writes:

> "Bottom, the weaver, wishing to play the lion, promises that, in order not to frighten the ladies, he 'will roar you as gently as any *sucking-dove*,' adding, 'I will roar you as 'twere any nightingale' (Act i. sc. 2). The expression in italics is so utterly nonsensical that it is marvellous how it has escaped criticism and condemnation. So far from suffering such a fate, it continues to be quoted as if it were some felicitous phrase. . . . . The blunder, which is whimsical enough, may be rectified by the smallest of alterations—by striking out a single letter from dove, leaving the clause, 'I will roar you as gently as any sucking-doe.' As dove was spelt 'doue' in Shakespeare's time, the transition from doe would be easy."—pp. 198.

Now mark how a short extract from such a common work as the "Penny Cyclopædia" demolishes all this ingenuity.

> "One part of the internal organization of the pigeon is worthy of special notice. The crop in the state which is adapted to ordinary digestion is thin and membranous, and the internal surface is smooth; but by the time the young are about to be hatched, the whole, except that part which lies on the trachea, becomes thicker, and puts on a glandular appearance, having its internal surface very irregular. In this organ it is that the food is elaborated by the parents before it is conveyed to the young, for a milky fluid of a greyish color is secreted and poured into the crop among the grain or seeds undergoing digestion, and a quality of food suited to the nestling is thus produced. The fluid coagulates with acids and forms curd, and the apparatus forms, among birds, the nearest approach to the mammæ of the warm-blooded animals. Hence, no doubt, the term 'pigeon's milk.'"—*Article* "*Columbidæ.*"

And hence, too, no doubt, Shakespeare's "sucking-dove." Similar objections might be taken to many other of Mr. Bailey's emenda-

---

[25] "The Odyssey of Homer." Edited, with Marginal References, various Readings, Notes, and Appendices, by Henry Hayman, B.D. Vol. I. Books I. to VI. London: David Nutt. 1866.

[26] "The Plays of Shakspeare." Edited and Annotated by Charles and Mary Cowden Clarke. Illustrated by H. C. Selous. London: Cassell, Petter, and Galpin. 1865, 1866.

[27] "The Works of William Shakspeare." The Text Revised by the Rev. Alexander Dyce. In eight volumes. Vol. VII. Second edition. London: Chapman and Hall. 1866.

[28] "On the Received Text of Shakespeare's Dramatic Writings, and its Improvement." By Samuel Bailey. Vol. II. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1866.

tions. He, however, is open to conviction, and is candid enough to acknowledge that Mr. Singer's "rother's sides" is preferable to his own ingenious "browser's sides" in "Timon of Athens" (Act iv. sc. 3). His book, if taken cautiously, may be of real service to the critic.

The last, and the least too in size of Shakespearian books this quarter is "the Songs and Sonnets."[29] We need not say that it is well edited, for it is edited by Mr. Palgrave. Alexander had a casket made for the "Iliad," and Messrs. Macmillan have made one for Shakespeare's Sonnets. It is a dainty edition in every respect—binding, type, and paper. The notes, too, are admirable, short yet clear. Mr. Palgrave has his own theory upon "the Sonnets," but about this we shall say nothing, as Mr. Gerald Massey promises to clear up all mystery in his forthcoming work.

In our last number we noticed Mr. Farrar's excellent work on the onomatopoetic theory. We now have Mr. Wedgwood himself[30] on the subject. No theory has, perhaps, been so abused. Berkeley was supposed to be conquered by a grin, and Mr. Wedgwood by an epigram. The theory, however, has gained ground in spite of misrepresentation and in spite of nicknames. We shall anxiously look forward to what Max Müller and his followers may have to reply; at present they have answered only with sarcasms. Mr. Wedgwood conducts his argument with a calmness which cannot be too much admired. He has not exhausted his subject in the present little volume, simply because it is inexhaustible. One can scarcely turn to any language without finding some corroboration of his views. The history of the onomatopoetic theory in England is a warning to scholars. Dr. Charnock's book[31] is a very second-rate production by a second-rate mind. He possesses no power of real criticism. One authority seems as good as another to him. He does not digest his learning. Thus, to take an example, he quotes under Lullaby—"Lullaby, or L'Ellaby, from a supposed fairy called Ellaby Gathon, whom nurses invited to watch the sleeping babes, that they might not be changed for others. Hence changeling, or infant changed." Now this is so much nonsense, and not very amusing nonsense. It is like the genealogy of Heralds. For the proper treatment of the word let Dr. Charnock turn to Wedgwood's Dictionary. We see that Dr. Charnock promises us a glossary of the provincialisms of Essex. Here he may do real service, but he must be content to collect, and not theorize. A complete revival of Middle Age and early Northern literature is going on. Everything that Mr. Ludlow[32] gives us is sure to be good and substantial. His workmanship is sound, but his style is heavy. "Il est Anglais," as M. le Maire said, when Mr. Sabine Baring-Gould proposed to attack the loup-garou. And so, too, Mr. Ludlow attacks the great epics of the Middle Ages, and in these volumes gives us the spoils. The first part is to us the most interesting, and we wish that Mr. Ludlow had extended his chapter on the Growth of Legend into a longer essay. His book, we fear, will be more often referred to than read, and more often plundered than acknowledged. The three most interesting chapters in Mr. Sabine Baring-Gould's work[33] are those on the "Were-Wolf in the North," "The Origin of the Scandinavian Were-Wolf," and "The Were-Wolf in the Middle Ages." And he well illustrates what he has said of the advantage of the study of Norse Mythology. He writes fluently, and possesses a keen eye for whatever is picturesque. For our own part, we should be inclined to regard lycanthropy certainly in many cases as nothing more than the result of the human mind hardening poetry into fact, and materializing what had been taught in a spiritual sense. Two translations from the Norse have also appeared.[34] They are works, however, more suitable for the "specialist" than the general critic to deal with. We can, however, say that Sir Edmund Head's rendering, like everything that he writes, is marked by both ease and vigour. Amongst other translations, from very different sources, we must mention Mr. Wells's "Eastern Tales,"[35] and Mr. Brooks's rendering of Richter's "Hesperus."[36] To many, whatever Richter wrote is quite as wonderful as the "Thousand and One Nights." The Rhine and the Ganges, it has been well said, are only geographically distinct. Englishmen can now amuse themselves in tracing resemblances between Mr. Wells's Eastern tales and the Orientalisms of Jean Paul, in Mr. Brooks's very readable translation of an untranslatable work. Amongst books which refuse to be classed under any denomination is Mr. Ruskin's "Ethics of the Dust."[37] We should be very sorry to treat him in the way in which he treats others. Indeed, he seems rather to be an object for commiseration than

[29] "Songs and Sonnets." By William Shakspeare. London and Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. 1865.

[30] "On the Origin of Language." By Hensleigh Wedgwood. London: Trübner and Co. 1866.

[31] "Verba Nominalia; or, Words derived from Proper Names." By Richard Stephen Charnock, Ph. Dr. London: Trübner and Co. 1866.

[32] "Popular Epics of the Middle Ages of the Norse-German and Carlovingian Cycles." By John Malcolm Ludlow. London and Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. 1865.

[33] "The Book of Were-Wolves: being an Account of a Terrible Superstition." By Sabine Baring-Gould, M.A. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865.

[34] (1) "The Story of Viga-Glum." Translated from the Icelandic. With Notes and an Introduction. By the Right Hon. Sir Edmund Head, Bart., K.C.B. London: Williams and Norgate. 1866. (2) "The Edda of Sæmund the Learned." From the Old Norse. With a Mythological Index. Part I. London: Trübner and Co. 1866.

[35] "Mehemet, the Kurd, and other Tales from Eastern Sources." By Charles Wells. London Bell and Daldy. 1865.

[36] "Hesperus; or, Forty-five Dog-Post Days." A Biography. From the German of Jean Paul Friedrich Richter. Translated by Charles T. Brooks. London: Trübner and Co. 1865.

[37] "The Ethics of the Dust." Ten Lectures to Little Housewives on the Elements of Crystallization. By John Ruskin, M.A. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1866.

for criticism. This is the manner in which he thinks it decent to oppose certain well-ascertained conclusions of modern science: "Lecturer.—Do you think you don't know whether you are alive or not? (Isabel skips to the end of the room and back.) Yes, Isabel, that's all very fine, and you and I may call that being; but a modern philosopher calls it being 'in a mode of motion.' It requires a certain quantity of heat to take you to the side-board, and exactly the same quantity to bring you back again—that's all." (p. 46.). Paley has said that you can't refute a sneer. Luckily, however, a sneer refutes itself. But we will not bid Mr. Ruskin look to Paley, but rather to Butler, who in his famous tenth sermon says "it is as easy to shut the eyes of the mind as those of the head."

A solitary topographical work, the Rev. S. Smith's, "The Temple and the Sepulchre,"[38] appears. None but those who have made this subject a study, and who have seen the actual locality, can be judges of its merits or demerits. We possess neither qualification. All that we can say is, that the arguments are temperately expressed, the descriptions good, and the illustrations are a great help to the text, which is by no means always the case in similar works. Two Christmas books, as we suppose they must be called, reached us too late to be noticed in our last number. It is not, however, of much consequence, for they will be welcomed at any season. Mr. Millais's collection[39] is of a very miscellaneous kind. But every one who cares not for Millais alone, but the progress of art, should certainly study this volume. Goethe used to advise the study of nature in her monstrosities, and even in the poorest sketches here—and there are some very poor—much may be learnt. The other is a child's book.[40] A well-told story is set off by Mr. Tenniel's illustrations. And we must say that we like Mr. Tenniel here far better than in the pages of *Punch*. It must, we should think, too, have been some relief to him to have escaped for once from satire to the poetry of childhood. Satire, such as Mr. Tenniel's was against Lincoln, must bring remorse, but a book like this nothing else but pleasure to both maker and reader. And here let us take occasion to notice another child's book, "The Butterfly's Gospel, and other Stories."[41] The names of the author and the translator are sufficient guarantees for its excellence. The publishers, we may add, have done their utmost to make the binding correspond with the text.

From France we have several novels. Amongst them "La Prime d'Honneur"[42] is remarkable for its descriptions of scenery. The account of the *combe*—or, in Devonshire dialect, coombe—is excellent. The author is very happy in all his home-scenes. He makes cabbages, potatoes, and bacon poetical. There is a farm-supper, as far as description goes, worthy of George Eliot. His rustics, however, do not possess the wit of George Eliot's yokels. But he is quite correct in saying that the labourer admires scenery, and notes the changes of the seasons, and the varying aspects of cloud and sky, more than those above him in life. And there is, too, a certain amount of truth in the following sentence, which might be remembered in England—"Il serait décidément plus facile d'éventrer un chêne de cent ans avec un couteau de deux sous que de faire entrer une idée de bon sens dans la tête d'un tueur de lièvres." The remark does not apply only to poachers. In a novel of M. Urbain Olivier's we naturally look for country scenes. In the present[43] the reader will not be disappointed. Here, as in George Eliot, we come upon rustic terms and provincialisms—to be found in no dictionary—which give the true local colouring to the dialogue. The philologist may certainly here pick up some fresh word-lore, whilst the artist may learn a lesson by the skill with which it is used. Further, the story possesses a great deal of humour, and a thoroughly healthy tone. It is a new thing for French novelists to be writing on the text.

> "Où peut-on être mieux,
> Où peut-on être mieux,
> Qu'au sein de sa famille?"

But it is a novelty in which we should like to see some further experiments. M. Edouard Ourliac gives us a collection of tales and essays.[44] Both are interesting. Thus, "La Petite Loiseau" is the story of a foundling, who, though motherless, still has a mother. The tale, though well told, is far too sentimental and theatrical. Wordsworth's "We are Seven" suggests the true method of treating such a subject. We trust, however, that M. Ourliac does not think that it is only by the Loire that a peasant's house "est plutôt une tanière qu'une habitation," and that only the peasants of La Varaine eat "du pain, toujours du pain, toujours." In Dorsetshire he might find similar hovels, whilst in London men and women lack even bread. Amongst the essays, those who relish genuine French humour should turn to "Le Gendarme." The title of a little handbook[45] to the French Exhibition of 1867 best explains its contents. On the whole, in spite of some tall talk about "le beau et le bon," it will

[38] "The Temple and the Sepulchre." By S. Smith, M.A., Vicar of Lois Weedon, and Rural Dean. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1865.

[39] "Millais's Illustrations." A Collection of Drawings on Wood. By John Everett Millais, R.A. London and New York: Alexander Strahan. 1866.

[40] "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland." By Lewis Carroll. With forty-two Illustrations by John Tenniel. London: Macmillan and Co. 1866.

[41] "The Butterfly's Gospel, and other Stories." By Frederika Bremer. Translated by Margaret Howitt. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder 1865.

[42] "La Prime d'Honneur." Par M. Calemard de la Fayette. Paris: Hachette et C^ie^. 1866.

[43] "L'Ouvrier. Histoire de Paysans." Par M. Urbain Olivier. Lausanne: Georges Bridel. 1866.

[44] "Les Contes de la Famille." Par M. Édouard Ourliac. Paris: Michel Lévy, Frères. 1866.

[45] "L'Exposition Universelle de 1867. Guide de l'Exposant et du Visiteur, avec les Documents Officiels, un Plan, et une Vue de l'Exposition." Paris: Hachette et C^ie^. 1866.

be found equally useful to the exhibitor and the mere visitor. Further, it contains a history of the various French Exhibitions, prefacing it with the quotation, "L'idée des expositions périodiques est une idée toute française." England, we suppose, must be content with the minor idea of expanding cucumber frames into crystal palaces.

Amongst reprints we have to acknowledge Mr. Booth's "Collection of Epigrams."[46] In spite of various improvements, many still remain to be made. In a third edition we should advise him to scrupulously weed out all those pieces where the humour depends upon the word rather than upon the thought. "The Biglow Papers,"[47] in their new form, are most suited for the railway, whilst "The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table"[48] is fitted for the drawing-room. Lastly, from Messrs. Smith, Elder, and Co. we have five reprints in their excellent monthly series of standard novels,[49] and from the Early English Text Society, three new volumes.[50]

[46] "Epigrams, Ancient and Modern." Edited by Rev. John Booth, B.A. Second Thousand. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1865.

[47] "The Biglow Papers." By James Russell Lowell. London: John Camden Hotten. 1865.

[48] "The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table." By Oliver Wendell Holmes. With Illustrations by J. C. Thompson. London: Alexander Strahan; and Sampson Low, Son, and Marston. 1865.

[49] (1) "Beyminstre." By the Author of "Lena." (2) "Entanglements." By the Author of "Mr. Arle." (3) "The School for Fathers." By Talbot Gwynne. (4) "Winifred's Wooing." By Georgiana M. Craik. (5) "Paul Ferroll." A Tale. London: Smith, Elder, and Co. 1865, 1866.

[50] (1) "The Wright's Chaste Wife." A Merry Tale, by Adam of Cobsam. Copied and Edited by Frederick J. Furnival. (2) "Merlin; or, the Early History of King Arthur." A Prose Romance (about 1450—1460 A.D.). Edited from the unique MS. in the University Library, Cambridge, by Henry B. Wheatley. With an Introduction by D. W. Nash, Esq., F.S.A. Part. I. (3) "The Monarch, and other Poems of Sir David Lyndesay." Edited by Fitzedward Hall. Part. I. London: published, for the Early English Text Society, by Trübner and Co. 1865.

PROFESSOR BLACKIE'S TRANSLATION OF ÆSCHYLUS.

In the last October number of this Review it was stated that Professor Blackie's translation of Æschylus "was aided by Prussian funds through Bunsen." The Professor has informed us that "there is not a shadow of truth in the statement." We are extremely sorry that, having been misinformed on the subject, we gave publicity to a false report.—*Editor of the Westminster Review.*

INDEX TO VOL. LXXXV.

Abati, see Reade, 277.

Abgeordnetenhauses, Stenographische Berichte der 2ten und 3ten Sessionen des, Wien, 169.

About, E., "Les Vacances de la Comtesse," 141.

——— "L'Assurance," 252.

Alby, Dr. Christoph, "Das Hochgebirge von Grindelwald," von E. von Fellenberg, und Pfarrer Gerwer, 260.

Alford, Henry, D.D., "Meditations in Advent, 104.

Allsop, Thomas, "Conversations, Letters, and Recollections of S. T. Coleridge." Edited by, 48.

Anderson, T., M.D., "Handbook for Yellow Fever, 265.

Argenson, Marquis de, "Mémoires et Journal inédit," 18.

Arnold, W., "Cultur und Rechtsleben," 252.

Auerbach, B., "Auf die Höhe," 140.

Austin, A., "Won by a Head. A Novel," 277.

Austria, The Situation in, 169–184; review of the events of 1860–61, 169, 170; the September manifesto, 170; history of the suspended Reichsrath, ib.; conduct of the German centralist-Liberals, 171; position of Schmerling, ib.; debates on the budget in 1864, ib.; the resignation of Schmerling and its causes, 172; antecedents of the new minister, Count Belcredi, ib.; his opinions as put forward in the Wiener Abendpost, 173; votes of the different Diets in respect to the September Patent, 173, 174; review of the speeches for and against the ministry, 174, 175; speeches in the Diet of Lower Austria, 175; Austro-German liberalism, 175, 176; the Bohemian Diet, 176; Dr. Rieger's speech in the Prague Diet, 177; support afforded the government by the Diets, ib.; Hungary: history of the "Old Conservatives," 178; Hungarian objections to the February Constitution, ib.; action of the counties, 179; nature of the connection with Austria, ib.; laws of 1848, 179, 180; Transylvania and Croatia, 180; equal claims of the nationalities, 181; Herr Palacky's essay, 182; impolicy of oppressing weaker races, ib.; probable future of the Slavonic states, 183; the Hungarian difficulty: dualism, ib.

Babington, Churchill, B.D., "Introductory Letter on Archæology," 123.

Bacon, "Guide to American Politics," 198.

Bailey, S., "On the Received Text of Shakespeare's Dramatic Writings," vol. ii., 281.

Bain, A., M.A., "The Emotions and the Will," 245.

Baird, W., M.D. See Richardson, 119.

"Bank, The, of England and the Organization of Credit," 110.

Barnum, P. T., "The Humbugs of the World," 252.

Beale, L. S., M.B., "The Distribution of Nerves to Voluntary Muscle," 120.

——— "On the Ultimate Nerve Fibres distributed to Muscle and some other Tissues," 120.

"Beaten Tracks; or, Pen and Pencil Sketches in Italy," 256.

Bellairs, Nona, "Hardy Ferns," 119.

Bernard, Claude, "Leçons sur les Propriétés des Tissus Vivants," 264.

——— "Introduction à l'Etude de la Médicine Expérimentale," 265.

Berry, Miss. See Lewis, 128.

Bertram, J. G., "The Harvest of the Sea," 261.

Bethlehem, the Royal Hospital of, 157–169; trials of the Reformer, 157, 158; novelty of the scientific treatment of insanity, 158; the practice of the ancients, 159; Hippocrates, ib.; insanity in the Middle Ages, ib.; foundation of Bethlehem Hospital, 159, 160; condition of the inmates, 160; investigation of Mr. Edward Wakefield in, ib.; William Norris, 160, 161; examination of the officers, horrible revelations, 161; second investigation in 1851, 162; misconduct of the treasurer, ib.; examination of Dr. Munro, 162, 163; Dr. Conolly's abolition of restraint at Hanwell, 163; obstinacy of the officers of Bethlehem, ib.; irresponsibility of the governors, 164; temporary reform, ib.; third investigation in 1864, ib.; exclusion, by the officers, of all the worst cases, 164, 165; condemnation of the site and structure of the building, 165; recommendations of the Charity Commissioners, 166; attempt at defence of the administration, ib.; obstacles to reform, 167; want of asylums for the lower middle-class, ib.; want of clinical instruction in mental diseases, 168; comparison between old and new Bethlehem hospitals, ib.; progress of medical science, 169; death of Dr. Conolly, ib.

Bethlehem Hospital, Reports of the Commissioners in Lunacy on, 157.

——— Report of the Charity Commisioners on, 157.

——— Annual Report of Bridewell and, 157.

Bigg, H. Heather, "Orthopraxy." 123.

Blanc, Louis, "Lettres sur l'Angleterre," 184.

Boner, C., "Transylvania: its Produce and its People," 114.

Booth, Rev. J., B.A., "Epigrams, Ancient and Modern," 294.

Bradbury, S. H., "Lyrical Fancies," 279.

Brande, W. T., D.C.L., and G. W. Fox, M.A., "A Dictionary of Science, Literature, and Art," 117.

Bremer, Fredrika, "The Butterfly's Gospel." Translated by Margaret Howitt, 283.

Brodie. See Hawkins, 263.

Brooke, S. H., "Life and Writings of F. W. Robertson, of Trinity Chapel, Brighton," 130.

——— C., "Ten Years in Sarawak," 254.

Brooks, C. T., "Hesperus." Translated from the German of J. P. Richter, 282.

Browning, E. B., "Selections from the Poetry of," 280.

Bryce, see Dulcken, 275.

Bunnett, F. E., 273.

Burke, Peter, "Celebrated Naval and Military Trials," 254.

Burton, "Melancholy Anatomized," principally founded on the larger work of, 139.

Buxton, Charles, "The Ideas of the Day on Policy," 248.

Carrel, Armand, "Œuvres Complètes de P. L. Courier, précédées d'un Essai sur la Vie et les Ecrits de l'Auteur," 211.
Carroll, L., "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland," 283.
Cassell's "Popular Natural History," 119.
Chambers, T. K., M.D., "Lectures, chiefly Clinical," 121.
——— ——— "Some Effects of the Climate of Italy," 264.
Chapman, M. J., M.A., "Hebrew Idylls and Dramas," 279.
——— "The Greek Pastoral Poets, Bion, &c.," 279.
Charnock, R. S., Ph. Dr., "Verba Nominalia," 282.
Chatrian, M. Erckmann, "Waterloo," 138.
Chorley, J. R., "The Wife's Litany," 279.
Clarke, C. and M. C., "The Plays of Shakespeare," edited, &c., 281.
Cobbold. See Richardson and White, 119.
Colani, T., "Sermon pour l'Ouverture solennelle de la Session du Consistoire supérieur," 104.
Colenso, see Oort, 98.
——— J. W., D.D., "Letters from the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Cape Town, and the Bishop of Natal," 247.
——— "A Letter to the Members of the Church in the Diocese of Natal," 247.
——— "Sermons preached at St. Peter's, Maritzburg," 247.
Coleridge's Writings, 48–60; forms of thought that are passing away, 48; the idea of the "relative" in modern thought, 49; Coleridge's struggle against it, ib.; Wordsworth's conviction of a latent intelligence in nature, 50; comparison of his talent and Coleridge's, ib.; the latter's great seriousness, ib.; his desire to found a religious philosophy, 51; his early literary success, ib.; he visits Germany, 52; the conflict between reason and faith, ib.; change in him on his return from Malta, 53; his sympathy with German transcendental philosophy, ib.; the "Philosophy of Nature," 53, 54; Kant's theory of perception, 54; what Coleridge means by imagination, 55; his view of the artistic faculty, 55, 56; his theological opinions, 56; "Aids to Reflection," ib.; the spiritual element in life, 57; Coleridge's defence of the rationality of the Church dogmas, 57; Kant's "speculative and practical reason," 58; true meaning of dogmas, 58, 59; "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," 59; Coleridge's true claim to our admiration, 60.
Coleridge. See Green, 246.
Commons round London, 216–224; difficulties connected with the growth of London, 217; transmutation of country into town, ib.; Wimbledon, 217, 218; Lord Spencer's proposal, 218; Hampstead Heath, ib.; fate of Wandsworth Common, 219; Blackheath, 219, 220; Epping Forest, 220; effect of enclosures on the population, ib.; purpose of the first enclosure acts, 221; the Statute of Merton, ib.; the Inclosures Act of 1845, ib.; have Londoners any right to Commons, 222; change effected by the application to feudalism of Roman law, 222, 223; Lords of the Manor and Common rights, 223, 224; Mr. Cowper's bill, 224.
Courier, Paul Louis, 211–216; in what sense Courier was a hero, 211, 212; his dislike of the military profession, 212; his desertion and subsequent leisure, ib.; his subsequent years of service, 213; his political and religious opinions, ib.; his "statement of his principles," 214; style of his pamphlets, ib.; extract from the "Simple Discours de Paul Louis, Vigneron," 215, 216; he is called to account by the government for his writings, 216; his other pamphlets, ib.; his assassination, ib.
Cooke, M. C., "Our Reptiles," 261.
Copland, James, M.D., "A Dictionary of Practical Medicine," 121.
"Cornelius O'Dowd upon Men and Women, and other Things in General," 279.
Cox, R., F.S.A., "The Literature of the Sabbath Question," 105.
Cox. See Brande, 171.
Craik, G. M., "Faith Unwin's Ordeal," 136.
——— "Winifred's Wooing," 284.
Cranbrook, Rev. J., "The Church of the Future," 104.
——— "Divine Providence in its Relations to Prayer and Plagues," 105.

Dallas, W. S. See Richardson, 119.
Darby, Eleanor, "Ruggiero Vivaldi, and other Lays of Italy," 280.
Daremberg, Ch., "La Médicine: Histoire et Doctrines," 264.
Dart, J. H., "The Iliad of Homer," Translated, 136.
Davenport, Dr. Christopher (Franciscus a Sancta Clara, S.T.P.), "Paraphrastica Expositio Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanæ." Reprinted with a Translation. Edited by F. G. Lee, D.C.L., 103.
Davésiés de Pontès, Lucien, "Etudes sur l'Angleterre," 184.
Dickens, Charles, "Our Mutual Friend," 276.
Donaldson, J., M.A., "A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine," vols. ii. and iii., "The Apologists," 237.
Dozy, Dr. R. See Oort, 98.
Dulcken, H. W., "A Picture History of England," illustrated by Messrs. Dalziel, from designs by A. W. Bryce, 275.
Dyce, Rev. A., "Works of William Shakespeare," 281.
Dyer, T. H., "A History of the City of Rome," 266.

"Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ," 243.
Edwards, H. S., "The Private History of the Polish Insurrection," 70.
——— J. jun., "On Letters Patent for Inventions," 111.
——— F. jun., "Our Domestic Fireplaces," 118.
——— ——— "A Treatise on Smoky Chimneys," 118.
——— Amelia B., "Half a Million of Money," 136.
Eichthal, M. Gustave d', "Etude sur les Origines Bouddhiques de la Civilization Américaine," 105.
Ellis, E., M.D., "The Progress of Medical Science," 123.
—— W., "Thoughts on the Future of the Human Race," 252.
"Entanglements," 284.
Esquiros, A., "Cornwall and its Coasts," 114, 184.
"Ewing, James, Memoirs of," by the Rev. M. Mackay, 273.
"Exposition (L') Universelle de 1867," 283.

Farrar, Rev. Frederick, M.A., "Chapters on Language," 138.
Fawcett, H., M.P., "The Economic Position of the British Labourer," 108.
Fayette, M. Calemard de la, "La Prime d'Honneur," 283.
Fellenberg. See Alby, 260.
Ferguson, J., F.R.S., "A History of Architecture," 265.
Figuier, Louis, "L'Année Scientifique et Industrielle," 258.
——— ——— "The World Before the Deluge," 259.

Fitzpatrick, W. J., "The Sham Squire and the Informers of 1798," 132.
French Opinions of the English, 184–198; calumnies of nations on each other, 184; the difficulty of being just, ib.; Voltaire's praise of England, 185; M. Louis Blanc's opinion, ib.; M. Taine on the English, 186; on the English climate, ib.; on London, ib.; on our scenery, 187; atmosphere, ib.; on our eating and drinking, ib.; our physical characteristics, ib; on the love of Englishmen for athletic sports, 188; on English girls, ib.; on "the dangerous classes," ib.; our English rural life, 189; our aristocracy, ib.; on our clergy, 190; Louis Blanc, ib.; his style, ib.; M. Esquiros, ib.; Louis Blanc's advice, 191; M. de Witt, ib.; conduct of England, ib.; the dualism in English natures, 192; Louis Blanc on England in the American war, ib.; as a political writer, 193; quotation from his "Organisation of Labour," 194; on the English aristocracy, ib.; Montalembert, ib.; Louis Blanc on the Derby, 195; on "strikes," ib.; on universal suffrage, ib.; on the English mind, ib.; on the French mind, ib.; Mr. Matthew Arnold's views, 196; "L'enfant du pauvre," 197; M. Lucien Davésiés de Pontés, ib.; his testimony, ib.; Louis Blanc on the co-operative system, 198; tendency of the French Emperor, ib.
French Revolution, Precursors of the, Saint Pierre and D'Argenson, 18–34; the club of the Entresol, 18; Abbé Alary, ib.; his position, 19; Fleury upon the Club, ib.; D'Argenson, 20; Saint Pierre, birth of, ib.; his arrangement with Varignon, 20, 21; "bienfaisance," its meaning, ib.; Saint Pierre's first literary occupation, ib.; becomes almoner to the Duchess of Orleans, ib.; his conversation, 22; boldness of his views, ib.; engaged on political science, ib.; his views, ib.; his religious toleration, 23; his views on Christianity, 24; on national education, ib.; his scheme, 24, 25; on moral instruction, 25; "Polysynodie," ib.; public censure, 26; his treatment by the Academy, ib.; his criticism on the character of Louis XIV., 27; his views on international peace, ib.; how he exhibited them, 28; his arguments, ib.; the privilege of private war, 29; Cobden on war, ib.; St. Pierre's plan, 30; contrasted with Cobden's, ib.; Mr. Gladstone upon war, 31; D'Argenson, ib.; Voltaire's opinion on, ib.; D'Argenson's political work, 32; analysis of, ib.; compared with Lafayette, 33; his peace policy, ib.; D'Argenson and St. Pierre regarded as exponents of the ideas of the time, 33, 34.
Fuhlrott, C., "Der Fossile Mensch aus dem Neanderthal, und sein Verhältniss zum Alter des Menchengeschlechts," 262.
Fulford, William, M.A., "Lancelot, with Sonnets, and other Poems," 279.
Furnival, Frederick J., "The Wright's Chaste Wife." A merry Tale, by Adam of Cobsam. Copied and edited by, 284.

Galloway, William, A.M., M.D., "On Reflex Paralysis," 123.
Galt, William, "Railway Reform: its Importance and Practicability, as affecting the Nation, the Shareholders, and the Government," 143.
Gaskell, Mrs., "Lizzie Leigh, and other Tales," 141.
——— "The Grey Woman and other Tales," 141.
——— "Cousin Phyllis, and other Tales," 141.
——— "Wives and Daughters. An Everyday Story," 278.
"Gazetteer, the Imperial, of England and Wales," 254.
Gerwer, Pfarrer. See Alby.
Gibbs, William Alfred, "The Story of a Life, and other Works," 280.
Ginsburg, Christian D., LL.D., "The Kabbala: its Doctrines, Development, and Literature," 105.
Gladstone, W. E., M.P., "Address on the Place of Ancient Greece in the Providential Order of the World," 124.
Glover, John, M.A., "Le Livere de Reis de Britannie et le Livere de Reis d'Angleterre," 268.
Göll, Hermann, "Kulturbilder aus Hellas und Rom," 132.
Gould, Sabine Baring, M.A., "The Book of Were Wolves: being an Account of a Terrible Superstition," 282.
Grahame, J. R., "The Progress of Science, Art, and Literature in Russia," 114.
Green, Joseph Henry, F.R.S., D.C.L., "Spiritual Philosophy, founded on the teachings of the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge," 246.
——— Mary Ann Everett, "Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series, of the reign of Charles II., 1665," 270.
Guérin, Eugénie de. See Trebutien.

Haeckel, Ernst, Dr., Beiträge zur Naturgeschichte der Hydromedusen," 260.
Hall, Fitzedward, "The Monarch, and other Poems of Sir David Lyndesay," edited by, 284.
——— Spencer, "Documents from Simancas," &c., edited by, 126.
Hammond, W. A., M.D., "On Wakefulness. With an Introductory Chapter on the Physiology of Sleep," 264.
Hardy, Thomas Duffus, "Descriptive Catalogue of Materials relating to the History of Great Britain to the end of the Reign of Henry VII.," 125.
Haswell, G. C., "On the Silurian Formation in the Pentland Hills," 259.
Hawkins, Charles, "The Works of Sir Benjamin Brodie, D.C.L.," collected and arranged by, 263.
Hawthorne, N., "Transformation," 141.
Hayman, Henry, "The Odyssey of Homer," edited, with Marginal References, various Readings, Notes, and Appendices, by, 281.
Head, Right Hon. Sir Edmund, Bart., K.C.B., "The Story of Viga-Glum," translated from the Icelandic. With Notes and an Introduction, by, 282.
Hebler, C., "Aufsatze über Shakespear," 141.
Hennell, S. S., "Present Religion; as a Faith, owning Fellowship with Thought," 106.
Hessling, Theodore von, "Grundzüge der allgemeinen und speciellen Gewebelehre des Menschen," 264.
Hickey, W., "The Constitution of the United States of America," 198.
"Hidden Depths," 278.
Hill, S. S., F.R.G.S., "Travels in Egypt and Syria," 114.
Hingston, E. P., "Artemus Ward," edited by, 139.
Hoffman, A. W., LL.D., F.R.S., "Introduction to Modern Chemistry, Experimental and Theoretic," 277.
Hole, Rev. Charles, M.A., "A Brief Biographical Dictionary," 132.
Holloway, John, "Essays on the Indian Mutiny," 127.
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, "The Autocrat of the Breakfast Table," 284.
Homer. See Dart, Hayman, Musgrave, Worsley, Wright.
Hopkins, J. B., "A Reasonable Faith," 105.
Houghton, Rev. W., M.A., F.L.S., "An Essay on the Canticles, or the Song of Songs," 102.
Howe, Alexander H., M.D., "A Theoretical Inquiry into the Physical Causes of Epidemic Diseases," 265.
Howitt. See Bremer.
Hunter, C., "On the Speedy Relief of Pain," 122.

Hurlburt, J. B., M.A., LL.D., "Britain and her Colonies," 113.
Hutchinson, James, "Sir William Hamilton: being the Philosophy of Perception," 107.
Huxley. See Laing.

"Ignatius, Life of Father," 244.
Irons, W. J., D.D., "The Bible and its Interpreters," 102.
Italy. See Taine.
"India, The Friend of," "The Proposed Mysore Crime," from, 116.

"Jackson's Gymnastics for the Fingers and Wrists," 120.
Johnson, Andrew, "The Presidential Message of," 198. See United States Constitution.
Jones, Rev. Harry, M.A., "The Regular Swiss Round," 115.
Joselian, P., "A Short History of the Georgian Church," translated by the Rev. S. C. Malan from the Russian of, 245.

Kiehl, W. F. P., Dr., "Ueber den Ursprung und die Verhütung der Seuchen. Erläutert durch das Beispiel der ansteckenden Cholera," 265.
King, C. W., M.A., "The Natural History, Ancient and Modern, of Precious Stones and Gems," 118.
Kingsley, G. H., M.D., "Chaucer, Animadversions upon, sett doune by Francis Thynne," edited by, 141.
Koffka, Wilhelm, "Iffland und Dalberg," 140.
Kolbe, Herman, "Das chemische Laboratorium der Universitäts Marburg," 258.
Kuenen, A., "Histoire Critique des Livres de l'Ancien Testament," 241.

Laing, S., M.P., F.G.S., "Prehistoric Remains of Caithness," with Notes on the Human Remains, by Thomas H. Huxley, F.R.S., 262.
Lang, Gideon S., "The Aborigines of Australia," 120.
Lee, F. G., "Paraphrastica Expositio Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanæ," edited by, 103.
Leighton, Alexander, "Shelburn," 136.
——— John, F.S.A., "The Life of Man Symbolised by the Months of the Year," 140.
Lewis, Lady Theresa, "Extracts of the Journals and Correspondence of Miss Berry," 128.
Liefde, John de, "Six Months among the Charities of Europe," 112.
Lindley, John, "The Treasury of Botany: a Popular Dictionary of the Vegetable Kingdom," edited by, and Thomas Moore, 260.
Livingstone's, Dr., Recent Travels, 81–95; leaves England, 81; the Kongone, ib.; description of its scenery, ib.; the Isle of Simbo, ib.; fever, 82; rapids, ib.; reach the Shire, ib.; cataracts, ib.; Lake Shirwa, 83; description of the Shire, ib; the tribes of the Manganja Hills, ib.; customs, ib.; cotton, 84; trade, ib.; drunkenness, ib.; further accounts of the Manganjese, ib.; the upper-lip ring, ib.; fresh preparations, 85; elephant killed, ib.; cooked, ib.; lion country, 86; hippopotami, ib.; grass burning, ib.; the Go-Nakeds, ib.; description of, ib.; the Victoria Falls, 87; Mr. Baldwin, ib.; leprosy, 88; belief of the natives in medicines, ib.; encounter with a Portuguese trader, ib.; Bishop Mackenzie arrives, ib.; the slave-trade, 89; Lake Nyassa, ib.; death of Bishop Mackenzie, 90; death of Mrs. Livingstone, ib.; valley of the Rovuma, ib.; horrors of the slave-trade, 91; conduct of the Portuguese Government, ib.; Murchison Cataracts, ib.; sickness, 92; obliged to leave, ib.; summary of Livingstone's discoveries, ib.; mechanical arts and agriculture, ib.; intelligence of the blacks, 93; their vanity, ib.; their religious notions, ib.; condition of the women, ib.; the domestic arrangements, ib.; so-called servants, 94; supply of food, ib.; distinctions of race, ib.; natural history, ib.; the "Honey Guide," ib.; the elephants, ib.; the botany, 94, 95; future plans of Livingstone, 95.
Lorimer, J., "The Constitutionalism of the Future," 247.
Lloyd, W. W., "Christianity in the Cartoons referred to Artistic Treatment and Historic Fact," 97.
Lowell, James Russell, "The Biglow Papers," 284.
Ludlow, John Malcolm, "Popular Epics of the Middle Ages, of the Norse-German and Carlovingian Cycles," 282.
Lysons, Rev. Samuel, M.A., F.S.A., "Our British Ancestors: who and what they were," 125.
Lytton, Sir Edward Bulwer, Bart., M.P., "The Lost Tales of Miletus," 280.

Mackay, Alexander, A.M., F.R.G.S., "Outlines of Modern Geography: a Book for Beginners," 118.
Macleod, Norman, D.D., "Eastward," 256.
Macpherson, Major Samuel, C.B., "Memorials of Service in India," from the correspondence of, 255.
Mario, Alberto, "The Red Shirt," 253.
Marmont, Marshal, "On Modern Armies," 112.
Martin, Theodore, "Faust," translated by, 138.
Massey, Right Hon. William, "A History of England during the reign of George III.," 127.
Maurice, Rev. F. D., M.A., "The Conflict of Good and Evil in our Day," 245.
McCosh, James, LL.D., "An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's 'Philosophy,' being a Defence of Fundamental Truths," 246.
——— ——— "Dugald Stewart's Outlines of Moral Philosophy," edited by, 107.
"Melancholy Anatomised," principally founded on Burton's "Anatomy of Melancholy," 139.
Meredith, George, "Rhoda," 135.
Merivale, Charles, B.D., "The Conversion of the Northern Nations. The Boyle Lectures for the year 1865," 238.
Michelet, J., "Le Peuple," 249.
Mill, John Stuart, on the Philosophy of Sir W. Hamilton, 1–18; influence of Hamilton, 1; his work, ib.; his erudition and independence, 2; James Mill, ib.; his character, 2, 3; "System of Logic," 3; "Elements of Political Economy," 4; "Essay on Liberty," ib.; the examination of Sir W. Hamilton, 4, 5; the Relativity of Human Knowledge, 5; Kant's doctrine of Relativity, ib.; Partial Relativity, ib.; Sir W. Hamilton's view, 5, 6; Sir W. Hamilton's review of Cousin's philosophy, 6; Mill's account, ib.; the Infinite, 6, 7; the seventh chapter of Mill's examination, 7; what is the goodness of God, 7, 8; our ready-made religious creeds, 8; Mr. Mill's famous declaration, ib.; predicates, 9; Consciousness, ib.; the proper method of interrogating Consciousness, 10; the introspective method, ib.; definition of matter, 11; primary qualities of matter, ib.; Platner, ib.; Hamilton on unconscious mental modifications, 12; Hamilton's theory of causation, ib.; Hamilton's doctrine of Concepts, 13; Mill on Judgment and Reasoning, ib.; Sir W. Hamilton's additions to Formal Logic, 13, 14; no real distinction between Judgment in Comprehension and Judgment in Extension, 14; Freedom of Will, 15; Necessity, ib.; connexion between Free Will and Accountability, 16; Mill on Hamilton's general merits, ib.; Hamilton's great erudition, 17; Hamilton and Brown, ib.; Hamilton and Whately, ib.; Mill's criticism, 18; allegiance to philosophy, ib.
Millais, John Everett, R.A., "Millais's Illustrations," by, 283.

Montgomery, Henry R., "Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Sir Richard Steele, Soldier, Dramatist, Essayist, Patriot," 127.
Moon, G. Washington, "Elijah the Prophet. An Epic Poem," 279.
Moore, Thomas, "The Treasury of Botany: a Popular Dictionary of the Vegetable Kingdom," edited by, 260. See also Lindley.
Morris, Richard, "The Story of Genesis and Exodus." An early English Song. Edited by, 141.
Mozley, J. B., "Eight Lectures on Miracles," 240.
Müller, W., "Eine Fahrt durch Lahnthal," 117.
Musgrave, George, M.A., "The Odyssey of Homer," rendered into blank verse by, 137.
——— Captain Thomas, "Cast Away on the Auckland Isles," 254.

Natal, Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of, "Letters from," 247.
——— "A Letter to the Members of the United Church of England and Ireland in the Diocese of Natal," 247.
——— "Sermons preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Peter's, Maritzburg," 247. See also Oort.
Neumann, Karl Friedrich, "Geschichte der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika," 126.
Nicholson, N. A., M.A., "The Science of Exchanges," 110.
Nicholas, S. S., "Conservative Essays, Legal and Political," 111.
Nicolas, Michel, "Études sur les Évangiles Apocryphes," 242.
Nohl, Max, "Tagebuch einer Italienischen Reise," 256.

Olivier, Urbain, "L'Ouvrier. Histoire de Paysans," 283.
Oort, Dr. H., "The Worship of Baalim in Israel: based upon the work of Dr. R. Dozy, 'The Israelites at Mecca,'" by, and translated by the Bishop of Natal, 98.
Osborne, Captain, "Quedah: a Cruise in Japanese Waters; and the Fight on the Peiho," 256.
Ourliac, Édouard, "Les Contes de la Famille," 283.
Owen, Richard, F.R.S., "On the Anatomy of Vertebrates," 260.

Palmerston, Lord, 34–48; his career, 34; the Temples, ib.; his birth, 35; his education, ib.; his early Parliamentary career, ib.; his narrow escape, ib.; his Independence first shown, 36; his admiration of Canning, ib.; his starting point in politics, 37; on the Catholic Relief Bill, ib.; leaves the Tories, ib.; as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, 38; his speech on the 1st June, 1829, ib.; his political principles, ib.; Talleyrand on Palmerston, 39; availed himself of public opinion, ib.; his theory of "moral intervention," 40; his transactions with Don Miguel, ib.; second interference with the affairs of Portugal, 41; his defence of Turkey, ib.; his opposition to the slave-trade, ib.; the question of the Spanish Marriages, 42; the case of Pacifico, ib.; Lord Palmerston's speech, 43; the *coup d'état* of Louis Napoleon, 44; complications, ib.; Lord Aberdeen's administration, 45; Palmerston premier, ib.; his tact, 46; the Chinese Question, ib.; appeals to the country, ib.; Indian Mutiny, ib.; the Alien Act, ib.; Mr. Disraeli's Reform Bill, 47; Lord Palmerston's return to power, ib.; his sympathies in the American struggle, 47, 48; his general policy, 48; conclusion, ib.
Parent, Auguste, "Siège de Jotapata, épisode de la Révolte des Juifs," 267.
Parville, Henri de, "Causeries Scientifiques, Découvertes, et Inventions, Progrès de la Science et de l'Industrie," 259.
Peacock, Thomas B., M.D., "On some of the Causes and Effects of Valvular Disease of the Heart, being the Croonian Lectures of the Royal College of Physicians for 1865," 120.
Pellétan, Eugène, "La Mère," 112.
Pennell, H. Cholmondeley, "The Book of the Pike: a Practical Treatise on the various Methods of Jack Fishing," 119.
Perry, George G., M.A., "Morte Arthure," edited by, 141.
"Physiological Experiments: Vivisection." See Vivisection.
"Pictures of Society; Grave and Gay," 140.
Pigot, Richard, "The Life of Man Symbolised by the Months of the Year," with passages selected by, 140. See Leighton.
Plumptre, E. H., M.A., "Theology and Life. Sermons chiefly on Special Occasions," 245.
——— "The Tragedies of Sophocles." A New Translation, with a biographical essay by, 137.
Polish Insurrection of 1863, 70–80; the political position of the Poles, 70; their wrongs, ib.; representations of Russia, 71; Mr. Edwards upon, ib.; cause of the insurrection, ib.; the state of feeling in Poland, 71, 72; the dreams of the Poles, 72; the programme of Count Andrew Zamoyski, ib.; attachment of the Poles to law, ib.; condition of, under Gortchakoff, 73; "demonstrations," ib.; outrages by Russia, ib.; the plan of Mieroslawski, ib.; protest of the Nation, 74; petition to the Emperor, ib.; his answer, ib.; the dissolution of the Agricultural Society, ib.; attack of the troops on the people, ib.; "the party of action," ib.: influence of Zamoyski, 75; the reforms of the Russian government, ib.; outburst of popular indignation, ib.; organisation of the parties, ib.; the Grand Duke Constantine wounded, ib.; address of the principal landed proprietors, 76; Mr. Edwards' description of the Pole, ib.; criticism on, ib.; the value of the reforms, 77; proceedings of the National Committee, 77, 78; Wielopolski, 78; his policy, ib.; the insurrection, ib.; the junction of the "moderate party," ib.; foreign intervention, its effect, 79; England's conduct, ib.; solution of the Polish question, 80.
"Precursors of the French Revolution." See French Revolution.
Prendergast, Thomas, "The Mastery of Languages; or, the Art of Speaking Foreign Tongues Idiomatically," 262.
Pressensé, E. de, "Jésus Christ: son Temps, sa Vie, son Œuvre," 244.
Proudhon, P. J., "De la Capacité Politique des Classes Ouvrières," 250.

Railway Reform, 143–157; contrasts in European life, 143; activity of the age, ib.; the art of carriage, ib.; modern theories on travelling, ib.; principles of the English railway system, 143, 144; power of habits of thought, 144; average number of passengers in a train, 145; expense of conveying a train a mile, ib.; expense of conveying a passenger a mile, ib.; present fares on the Brighton line, ib.; consequences from lowering fares, ib.; the cases of the North Western and Great Northern, in 1857, 145, 146; the cases of the Edinburgh and Glasgow, and Caledonian, 146; upon what the profits of companies depend, ib.; fares of the North and South Western Railway, ib.; fares of the North London, ib.; other railways, ib.; the duty of the public towards railways, 147; charges for carrying coal, ib.; evidence of the Manager of the Midland Counties, ib.; the

Great Eastern and the coal question, ib.; the meaning of "monopoly" and "competition," ib.; the monopoly enjoyed by railroad companies, 148; lowering of fares,—analogy in the case of the Post Office, 148, 149; benefits to the poor, 149; the case of the London and North Western, ib.; Mr. Chadwick's paper upon, ib.; unsoundness of the present system, 149, 150; "free competition," meaning of in railways, 150; Captain Laws' evidence, ib.; the alliance between Railway Companies, 150, 151; its dangers, 151; strife between the Companies and the public, ib.; further considerations on the same, ib.; connexion between Railway Companies and the House of Commons, 152; the Act of 1844, ib.; the report of the Committee, 152, 153; the terms of the Act, 153; suppositions in the event of this Act being carried out, ib.; selfishness and animosity of Railway Companies, ib.; amount of capital invested in railways, ib.; the value of railway property, 154; objections to the transfer of railway ownership, ib.; their character, ib.; the terms of the contract, 154, 155; the two points of view, 155; Government management, ib.; its fitness, ib.; leasing out the railways, 156; Mr. Galt's method, ib.; railway system abroad, ib.; "centralization," its meaning, ib.; its benefits in the case of railways, 156, 157; the state and the ownership of land, 157; its bearing upon railways, ib.

Rawlinson, George, M.A., "The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World," 125.

Reade, W. Winwood, "See-Saw. A Novel," 277.

Rennie, D. F., M.D., "Bhotan, and the Story of the Dooar War," &c., 255.

——— "Peking and the Pekingese during the First Year of the British Embassy at Peking," 115.

Reynolds, S. H., M.A., "System of Modern History. Part I. Rise of the European System," 124.

Richardson, Sir John, C.B., F.R.S., "The Museum of Natural History: being a Popular Account of the Structure, Habits, and Classification of the various departments of the Animal Kingdom," 119. See also Dallas, Cobbold, Baird, White.

Roberts, Charles, "Calendarium Genealogicum. Henry III. and Edward I.," 124.

——— William, M.D., "A Practical Treatise on Urinary and Renal Diseases," 263.

Ruskin, John, M.A., "The Ethics of the Dust," 282.

Sala, G. A., "A Trip to Barbary by a Roundabout Route," 253.

Sargans, Dr. Anton Henne von, "Manethos, die Origenes unserer Geschichte und Chronologie." 123.

Schmidt, Karl, "Die Anthropologie," 262.

——— "Vergleichende Tabellen ueber die Literatur und Staaten-Geschichte der wichtigsten Kulturvölker der Neueren Welt," 126.

Scott, Sir Walter, "Marmion: a Tale of Flodden Field," 140.

Seafield, Frank, M.A., "The Literature and Curiosities of Dreams," 120.

"Sermons on the Reunion of Christendom." Second series, 104.

Shakespeare, William, "Songs and Sonnets," 282. See Bailey, Clarke, Dyce.

Simson, Walter, "A History of the Gypsies, with Specimens of the Gypsy Language," 267.

Smiles, Samuel, "Lives of Boulton and Watt," 131.

Smith, Alexander, "Alfred Hagart's Household," 278.

——— "A Summer in Skye," 138.

——— Archdeacon, M.A., "Common Words with Curious Derivations," 138.

——— S., M.A. (Vicar of Lois Weedon), "The Temple and the Sepulchre," 283.

Smith, Sydney, "Wit and Wisdom of," 139.

Springer, Anton, "Geschichte Oesterreichs seit dem Wiener Frieden, 1809," 126.

Stanley, Arthur P., D.D., "Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church." Part II., 101.

Stapleton, A. G., "Intervention and Non-intervention," 249.

Stephens, Frederick G., "Flemish Relics; Architectural, Legendary, and Pictorial," 140.

Stewart, Dugald, "Outlines of Moral Philosophy," 107. See McCosh.

Stevenson, John, M.A., "Calender of State Papers, Foreign Series, 1560—1561," edited by, 132.

Stirling, J., "Practical Considerations on Banks, &c.," 110.

Stothard, Robert Thomas, "Psychoneurology," 122.

Strauss, David Friedrich, "A New Life of Jesus" (the authorized translation), 95.

Student, A, "The Physical History of the Earth," 259.

Taine, H., on Art and Italy, 224–237; the professional connoisseur, 224; his arts, 225; taken off by Burton and Foote and Jonson, ib.; criticism, its movement and development, ib.; Mr. Ruskin, ib.; his failings, 226; contrast between Mr. Ruskin and M. Taine, ib.; M. Taine's system, ib.; applied to Art, ib.; criticisms of Macaulay and Addison on Milton, ib.; M. Taine on Milton, 227; the success of M. Taine's method, ib.; his conclusions, ib.; his "Philosophy of Art," 228; what is art? ib.; literal imitation, ib.; Michael Angelo and the tomb of the Medicis, ib.; the "Kermess" of Rubens, ib.; the nature of a work of art, 228, 229; the law of its formation, 229; applied to different eras, ib.; M. Taine on beauty, ib.; on the embodiment of the spirit of the age, 230; the case of Wordsworth, ib.; of Rousseau, ib.; other examples, ib.; another class of men, ib.; the case of Shakespeare, 231; M. Taine on Italy, ib.; qualifications for a traveller, ib.; Macaulay in France, ib.; M. Taine's style, 231, 232; his remarks on Civita Vecchia, 232; on St. Peter's, ib.; on the churches of Naples, ib.; on Italian scenery, ib.; condition of the Neapolitans, ib.; difficulty of the Government, 233; position of the priests, ib.; on the Vatican, ib.; on Raphael, 233, 234; the "School of Athens," 234; Michael Angelo, ib.; the "Last Judgment," ib.; on Roman society, 235; on the so-called educated class, ib.; the Roman nobles, ib.; French troops in Rome, ib.; on Roman Catholicism, 235, 236; mysticism, its attractions, 236; the charm of M. Taine's book, ib.; the position of M. Taine, ib.; as an artist, 237; his "History of English Literature," ib.; summary, ib.

Ternaux, Mortimer M., "Histoire de la Terreur, 1792—1794, d'après les documents authentiques et des pieces inédites," 270.

Thomas, Annie, "Walter Goring. A Story," 278.

"Three Years among the Working Classes in the United States during the War," 109.

Trafford, F. G., "Maxwell Drewitt," 136.

Travis, Henry, M.D., "Moral Freedom Reconciled with Causation by the Analysis of the Process of Self-Determination," 106.

Trebutien, G. S., "Journal of Eugénie de Guérin," edited by, 129.

United States Constitution and the Secessionists, 198–211; first impressions of America, 198; freedom of opinion and language, 199; American newspapers, ib.; educational system, ib.; religious instruction, ib.; quality of the instruction, 200; special subjects, ib.; the patriotism of Americans, ib.; its causes, ib.; the feeling for the Union, ib.;

illegality of the course of the South, 201; the duty of the President, ib.; the Free-Soil policy, ib.; Lincoln a supporter of the Free-Soil policy, ib.; slavery the "corner-stone" of the South, 202; manifesto of the Free-Soil party, ib.; its policy, ib.; Fort Sumter, 202, 203; causes of the Southern separation, 203; Count Cavour upon, ib.; suspension of the Habeas Corpus, ib.; the Emancipation Proclamation, 203, 204; recognition of the negro states of Hayti and Liberia, 204; gallantry of the South, ib.; the Northern generals, ib.; Southern statesmen, tactics of, ib.; the Southern slave-trading policy, 205; Southern planters, ib.; collapse of the South, ib.; results of the war, ib.; Lincoln, ib.; his character, ib.; his death, ib.; its effect, 205, 206; Grant, 206; Andrew Johnson, ib.; his policy, 206, 207; proclamation of amnesty, 207; provisional governors, ib.; his speech to the Southern Deputation, ib.; summary of his policy, 208; Message to the Senate, ib.; analysis of, ib.; on the reorganization of the Southern States, ib.; concerning the freedmen, 209; speech of Mr. A. H. Stephens, ib.; the President on the condition of the States, ib.; Mr. A. H. Stephens on, 210; on secession, ib.; a free government compatible with a strong government, ib.; sympathy of the English working classes with the North, 211; a monarchy and a republic contrasted, ib.; England's wishes to America, ib.

VEREY, Joseph, "Idylls of the Hearth," 280.

Vesinier, P., "L'Histoire du Nouveau César, Louis Napoléon Bonaparte, Conspirateur," 131.

Vivisection: Phrenological Experiments, 60–70; Mr. Rowell's pamphlet, 60; feelings of the scientific man on the subject, ib.; "the ordinary indications" of pain misleading, 61; the sense of pain in animals and in men different, ib.; cases quoted by Mr. Rowell, ib.; pain in the case of horses and fish, ib.; the peritoneum in men and dogs, ib.; Arabs, insensibility to pain, 61, 62; conscientious scruples, 62; the French school of vivisection, ib.; Professor Taylor on vivisection, 63; Sir Charles Bell on, 64; his experiments, ib.; results, 65; Dr. Brown-Séquard's discoveries, 65, 66; Professor Rolleston on vivisection, ib.; the pain of vivisection considered, 66, 67; Dr. Brown-Séquard's opinion, 67; the use of experiments in lectures, 68; Acts of Parliament, ib.; the study of anatomy in the present day, ib.; cruelty to animals in England, 69; cruelty of cabmen, ib.; fox-hunting, ib.; horse-racing, 70; sporting, ib.

WARINGTON, George, F.C.S., "The Phenomena of Radiation, as exemplifying the Wisdom and Beneficence of God," 117.

Watts, John, Ph.D., "The Facts of the Cotton Famine," 250.

Wedgwood, Hensleigh, "On the Origin of Language," 282.

Wells, Charles, "Mehemet the Kurd, and other Tales from Eastern Sources," 282.

West, Rev. Thomas, "Ten Years in South Central Polynesia," 116.

White, Adam, "The Museum of Natural History: being a popular Account of the Structure, Habits, and Classification of the various Departments of the Animal Kingdom," 119. See Dallas, Richardson, Cobbold, Baird.

White, Captain L. Esmonde, "Irish Coast Tales of Love and Adventure," 136.

Whitehead, Mrs. Trafford, "The Grahams of Bracebridge House, Dydborough," 278.

Williamson, Alexander W., F.R.S., "Chemistry for Students," 257.

Wilson, Daniel, D.D., "Prehistoric Man: Researches into the Origin of Civilization in the Old and New Worlds," 120.

——— J. Crawford, "Lost and Found. A Pastoral," 280.

Worsley, Phillip Stanhope, M.A., "The Iliad of Homer," translated into English Verse in the Spenserian Stanza, by, 137.

Wright, Ichabod Charles, "The Iliad of Homer," translated by, 280.

Wyse, Right Hon. Sir Thomas, K.C.B., "An Excursion in the Peloponnesus," 113.

YATES, Edmund, "The Business of Pleasure," 133.

——————— "Running the Gauntlet," 134.

Yonge, Charles Duke, "The History of France under the Bourbons, A.D. 1597—1830," 269.